

The QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 566

OCTOBER, 1945

Vol. 283

1. **In France To-day.**
By Sir John Pollock, Bt.
2. **Reorganisation of the Foreign Service.**
By A. L. Kennedy, M.C.
3. **A New Deal for Coal.**
By The Viscount Castlereagh.
4. **The Christian Contribution to Social Order.**
By Rev. Canon Roger Lloyd.
5. **Burma.**
By F. Burton Leach, C.I.E.
6. **A Neglected Prophet.**
By R. F. Rattray, Ph.D.
7. **James Boswell in the Newer Light.**
By W. Forbes Gray.
8. **John Charles, Viscount Althorp, Third Earl Spencer.**
By The Earl Spencer.
9. **Pure Milk.**
By The Viscount Bledisloe, P.C., G.C.M.G., K.B.E.,
D.Sc., and Dr Walter R. Wooldridge, Ph.D., M.Sc.,
M.R.C.V.S.

Some Recent Books.

Published Quarterly by

THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY

Sole Agents for American Continent

131 VARICK STREET, NEW YORK

Single Copies, \$1.75

Yearly Subscription, \$6.50

Entered at New York Post Office as Second Class Matter

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY

TO SUBSCRIBERS

AND AGENCIES

Commencing with the January 1938 issue of the "QUARTERLY REVIEW," Subscribers will be supplied by the INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY, 131 VARICK STREET, NEW YORK CITY, to whom all renewals and enquiries regarding this periodical should be sent.

**THE
QUARTERLY
REVIEW**

No. 566.

**PUBLISHED IN
OCTOBER, 1945.**

**LONDON :
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.1.**

**NEW YORK :
THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY.
1945**

Entered as Second Class matter at the New York, U.S.A., Post Office

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

WHERE THERE'S NEED —



THERE'S THE SALVATION ARMY!

Teams of Salvation Army workers from Great Britain specially trained to cope with the problems of relief work are battling against appalling conditions of hunger, disease and homelessness in Holland and other liberated countries.

They are being helped by hundreds of trained Salvation Army Officers who have shared the trials of their countrymen in occupied lands during the war years, and whose knowledge of language and local need is a valuable asset.

MORE TEAMS MUST BE SENT OUT.

£50,000 IS NEEDED QUICKLY.

Please send your gift NOW—marking it "Relief Work—to



*General Carpenter,
101, Queen Victoria Street,
London, E.C.4.*

Member society of the Council of British Societies for Relief Abroad

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 566.—OCTOBER 1945.

Art. 1.—IN FRANCE TO-DAY.

FRANCE has passed through a great sickness. She has barely more than entered on her convalescence; that convalescence is painful and will be long. Some English people find it hard to understand this. They saw the enemy driven out of France. They knew that the bulk of the French nation, save for the fraction actively engaged in France's Home War—the organised resistance movement—was not involved in the war after 1940, during those five years that saw the whole of Great Britain devoting itself to the war effort in the Forces, the factories, and the fields. The fatigue, they think, should be ours: the French have not worked in the war, therefore when they were freed from the invader they should have been fresh and eager to resume the course of normal economic and political life. They ought immediately to have plunged into intense national activity, to have put their hand to the plough, since the gun was for so long denied to them.

It is not a reproach to those who hold this or some similar view to say that it is ill-founded. It has been extremely difficult even for those who know France well to judge the French situation in the past twelve months, unless they could cross the Channel and live quietly among the French for long enough to become used to the strange atmosphere breathed there. Moreover, pressing news from elsewhere has restricted to a minimum the publication in the London press of explanations from our foreign correspondents who can read beneath the surface.

There has been, and still is as these lines are written in July 1945 close to a small French town six hundred miles from Paris, and will surely still be there and all over France when they are printed, one overriding influence that governs the whole of French life. That

Vol. 283.—No. 566.

influence is the German occupation. Those who have lived through the war in our own happy land, the daily target of fire and bomb, cannot know the carking misery of occupation by the enemy. The French do not speak of 'the German occupation,' or 'the enemy occupation'; they say simply, 'the occupation.' The occupation was a press by which the life of France was squeezed ever tighter and tighter. Its iron impress is still on the nation. The occupier was smirking, stubborn, and, when roused, bestial. There were few corners of France where he was not seen; and, wherever he was, he was all-pervading. The only way for ordinary French folk to escape from the German in their path, on their doorstep, hatefully marching in their streets with an insolent air of unruffled superiority, dashing along their roads in the finest commandeered French cars, was to avoid him. They looked round him, they looked through him, when they had to speak to him they addressed him in the terms and tone of frigid impersonality. But the effort of self-restraint required to achieve this seeming ignorance of the occupier has left an enduring mark on the French. To ourselves such an effort might be less fierce. We thrive on understatement and, as they say in the theatre, by 'throwing away' dramatic effects. Not so the French. They are expansive, definite, expressive, prone to criticise out loud and not to conceal their likes and dislikes. Restive against authority, they resent still worse a foreign authority. The effort of ignoring the conqueror, under whose authority they had to live, in whose ultimate victory none but a small minority would ever believe, has seared the French soul.

Nor did the occupation have a moral effect only. Its physical and material effects too were immediate, terrible, and lasting. Since the German leaders themselves had announced that, whoever else might starve in Europe, the German people should not, it could cause no surprise for Germany to carry off for her own use the greater part of French agricultural produce, besides machinery and manufactured articles, of which vast stores were found even in private German homes after the capitulation of Germany, leaving but the scrapings of the pot for French sustenance. In productive country districts—and by no means all France is productive—the peasants, who could

conceal an uncertain amount of their produce from requisition, maintained a decent standard of nourishment: the cities and even many small towns starved. The quantity of food nominally to be obtained by ration cards was not enough in the long run to support life; and often rationed food, supposed to be distributed, was not available at all. Meat, butter, cheese, eggs, milk, jam, were articles of extreme rarity; fish barely existed; the supply of bread alone was regular but insufficient, especially for French workmen, who are great bread eaters. Men lost as much as 60 lb. in weight. This was the origin of the black market in France. To obtain the barest minimum necessary for existence recourse had to be had to extra-legal means. For about two years many law-abiding persons attempted to avoid the black market. By 1943, sooner than starve to death, they gave in. Let no one think this an exaggeration. I know men and women of unquestionable credibility who, before yielding to the temptation to buy in the black market, became walking skeletons, or fell down in the street from sheer exhaustion, or even were driven to pick up scraps dropped in the gutter. It is pitiful, in the middle of the summer of this year, still to see in the brilliant daylight of Paris gaunt creatures, men as well as women, turning out the refuse bins on to the pavement and searching through the muck on the chance that something eatable may still be there. Here is a list of staple foods obtainable under the occupation: meat (unboned), $\frac{1}{3}$ of a lb. per month; sugar, $1\frac{1}{8}$ lb. per month; fish, $\frac{4}{9}$ lb. every $2\frac{1}{2}$ months; eggs, 1 every 3 or 4 months; butter, $\frac{1}{3}$ to $\frac{4}{9}$ lb. per month; cheese, $\frac{1}{24}$ lb. per week; macaroni, $\frac{5}{9}$ lb. per month; coffee, one quarter real, the rest imitation, $\frac{1}{3}$ lb. per month; carrots, weighed with the green tops attached, 1 lb. per week; potatoes, scarce and irregular, and for six months in the winter of 1943-4 none at all; beans and dried peas, $\frac{5}{9}$ lb. every three months; fowls, never; milk only for infants and by prescription for the sick, and then most difficult to obtain; bread, $\frac{2}{3}$ lb. per day, rising in 1944 to $\frac{7}{9}$ lb. This list is taken from Paris; Bordeaux and Toulouse were both sensibly worse off. In those cities cat and dog meat was sold and eaten; it was notorious after the liberation that no one could keep a cat in the vicinity of thieving Spanish republican irregulars

in the south-west. The lamentable deficiency implied by such a diet was attempted to be made up by such vegetables as swedes and jerusalem artichokes, when obtainable, and even these, like anything that could be called real food, were only to be got after waiting in queues far longer than were ever seen in London. Wine, as true a necessity to the French as beer is to the English, was reduced to $1\frac{3}{4}$ pints per adult per week; tobacco to 40 cigarettes or $\frac{1}{11}$ lb. of loose tobacco every ten days for male adults—women had none. Starvation bred diseases which became rampant, among them some never seen in modern Europe save in Spain after the civil war. Rickets and tuberculosis spread like wildfire. Mortality among patients admitted to hospitals rose from 2 to 40 per cent. Thirty per cent. of young children in France were found to be suffering from curvature of the spine.

The deadly effect of the occupation did not arise from the sense of oppression it caused alone, nor yet solely from the starvation following in its train. Just as the latter was calculated by the Germans to sap the spirit of the French and in the end reduce them the more easily to the status of a slave-nation, so the black market, which came into being as a remedial measure practised by everyone who could produce, conceal, or carry food in whatever quantities for the benefit of fellow countrymen perishing for want of it, was encouraged by the Germans as a further means of general demoralisation. They themselves trafficked heavily in it. One pleasant dodge was to let food speculators, who flourish like a green bay tree in all countries and in all contingencies that give them a chance, wax fat to the tune of twenty or thirty million francs. Then the gestapo would pounce; profiteer and fortune would disappear, this grabbed, that liquidated. But there was also a third way in which the occupation weighed fearfully on the life of France. The defeat of 1940 had cost her 100,000 men dead on the field of battle, nearly two million prisoners of war in Germany. To this toll the occupation added over 600,000 deported on political grounds and 160,000 shot in France for various acts of resistance. This subtraction from the nation of nearly three million of its most vigorous sons and daughters involved a corresponding diminution in its vital force. Moreover, except for the small number of out-and-out

collaborators, most of whom by now have paid the penalty of their misdeeds with their lives or liberty, almost every French person knew, or was related to, or was in touch with some, often many, patriots who had suffered for direct opposition to the German yoke. No one knew when or on whom the next blow would fall. All lived in apprehension of denunciation, perquisition, and sudden unreasonable arrest. On top of the strain caused by heavy losses through death or in prison, disgust for the occupier, hunger resulting from the occupation, and fear for family and friends were the lot of French men and women for four long years. Only the completely unobservant or the wholly callous could expect that after such a trial a nation could right itself instantly. There was yet another evil force to be combated. The diabolic German invention of dividing France into two zones, the one totally occupied, the other nominally unoccupied but in reality governed at one remove by Germany through the arch-quislings Pétain and Laval, was slowly but surely raising a barrier of incomprehension and mistrust between the north and the south of France. It is very possible that, had not the Germans been forced by the Allied invasion of North Africa in November 1942 to end this system by the direct occupation of the whole country, the nation might have suffered a scission that years would be needed to cure. Happily even before the liberation this canker had vanished and all Frenchmen felt themselves as one again.

There exists one other word besides 'occupation' that holds a dominant place in the French mind to-day: that is 'Liberation.' The day of liberation, not that of victory in Europe, is the date by and from which is marked all that passes in French life. VE rejoicings were partial, unreal, and indeed scarcely noticed by the majority of the French. Far otherwise were the days of liberation. It is barely possible to imagine what liberation has meant to the French. An odious weight was suddenly lifted that was slowly stifling them. Not that they ever gave up hope, as the acts of the resistance movement abundantly testify, and according to reliable witnesses 90 per cent. of the nation was at heart with that gallant movement from the end of 1942 onwards. Earlier many in the so-called unoccupied zone had been

taken in by Pétain's unscrupulous window-dressing. Their disillusionment began before the total occupation of France ; and there were cases of men who had enrolled in the *milice*, the Vichy counterpart of the S.S., imagining that they were to combat bolshevism, and then resigning at the risk of their lives when they found themselves expected to track down Frenchmen whose only crime was to fight against Germany. Liberation was everything.

'We awaited the end,' wrote a well-known Paris medical specialist to me in July of this year, 'with patience. We considered the German so far outside our present and future life, we were most of all so ignorant of everything going on in the world, that in April 1944 the most serious observers estimated at two years the time still required to bring about the inevitable German defeat. But people with imagination—especially the blessed race of women—believed in an early Allied landing and its success—not too early, however, and certainly not nearly so successful as was proved by the event. Therefore the wonder of all Frenchmen is not yet calmed and for my part I read with the same passionate interest every new detail of the preparations of that gigantic expedition.'

In French minds the liberation is indissolubly bound up with the name of Great Britain. The French know and are logically grateful for the large part played in the liberation by the American army. But it is to us that their feeling goes out in a spontaneous enthusiasm that I believe to be indelible. When under the occupation one Frenchman said to another, 'Have you listened to the radio?' that meant without more ado the B.B.C. The first British woman to appear at the Arc de Triomphe after the liberation on the heels of General le Clerc's triumphant entry into Paris, was held the centre of a joyous, cheering, weeping tumult and was forced for two hours to stand and tell the crowd pressing round her all that had passed in England since 1940, how we had lived, what we had done, what we thought of France. Over and over again I have come on a streak of barely expressed fear that England had lost faith in France, despised her ; and have seen the joy when Frenchmen learned that none of us who really knew France had ever harboured so base a thought. Everything that has happened since the liberation, save one thing only, of which mention must be made later, tends to strengthen the French feeling, not so

much of gratitude to England as of joy to find England and France hand-in-hand again. The perfect bearing of the few British soldiers still to be seen in France and the electric personality of Field-Marshal Montgomery have helped in this: everyone wants to hear about 'Monty.' If a true understanding between the two nations is not durably welded out of this war's horrors, it will be our own fault. Never has England held in her hand so many trumps of admiration, affection, and sympathy.

Liberation was followed by disappointment. It was probably inevitable that the French should expect all their woes to disappear with the occupation that was the worst of them. They could not calculate beforehand the catastrophic results of the disruption of transport by road and rail owing to Allied bombing and sabotage by the F.F.I., nor those of Robin Hood habits ingrained by years of opposition, active and passive, to the occupier. The sudden withdrawal of German control which had been a regular, if harsh, despotism, demanded the imposition of another, national, control; and this was rendered impossible, first, by the state of war that continued to exist in eastern France and on the Atlantic seaboard for eight months more, with priority on road and rail for military requirements, secondly, by the disorganisation of the internal administration of France, the more acute by reason of the pursuit and chastisement of officials guilty of collaboration with the enemy. Government, central and local, had to be improvised under thoroughly awkward conditions. This has not been without its comic side. An Office for Potatoes was instituted—without any noticeable change on the potato front. Then an Office for New Potatoes—but there were none. Finally an Office for Fowls—but neither were any fowls seen on the market. Hungry France laughed, and squirmed, when it was solemnly announced that snails were decontrolled. In France, as in England, that weed, bureaucracy, has multiplied: there are now two functionaries for every one in 1939.

Instead of improving, the food situation, after a passing gleam of hope, became still worse. Meat and butter sank to one-third of the former ration; in December 1944 and January 1945 there was no butter at all, and it was not till last May that the butter ration rose again

to its former level. For seven months after the liberation no sugar whatsoever was distributed in Bordeaux or Toulouse. The supply of fish remained about the same, but that of cheese became most irregular and since May only has been stabilised at $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. per month. Bread has remained at the 1944 level. French people have been forced to think every day and all day how to assure themselves of their daily bread. It was mockery or crass ignorance when a well-known member of the U.S. Congress informed the American public last May that French children were healthy and well fed: no one living, like that hasty writer, at the Hotel Scribe in Paris and eating at admirably appointed Allied clubs and canteens, could form an opinion on the matter. One needs to travel in the *métro*, the Paris Underground, and the only means of transport in the capital, not in staff cars, to see how pale and drawn from undernourishment are French faces, how French eyes are filled with care, and to live with the French to watch them save each cigarette end, to dry the last grains of tobacco and work them up into fresh smokes. Liberation spelled freedom from German tyranny, but acuter hunger, cold, and want. Not food alone is scarce, but commodities of every kind: e.g. soap, string, needles, cotton, matches, candles. Paris shops still attempt some display in their windows: inside they are bare. In a once busy provincial clothing store I know the shelves are filled with cardboard boxes, all empty, and the proprietor thinks himself lucky to have the boxes; there is nothing for sale, except two dresses in the window at fantastic prices.

Prices have rocketed everywhere, the result of (1) the huge amount of currency in the hands of the black market, checked but not eradicated by the withdrawal in June of all notes over 20 frs. and their replacement by a fresh issue, (2) still more important, the scarcity of goods and the fear of yet greater scarcity, (3) the habit of illicit trading and the lawless ways formed under the occupation. The upward spiral began in September 1944 when the provisional government raised wages by 20 per cent. M. Pleven, the Finance Minister, tried to justify this last July by saying that an increase in production was expected as the result. If indeed this was the motive, it was a woeful miscalculation; more probably, however, it came

from mere pressure exercised by the trade unions. In any case, the first rise in wages was followed by a rise in prices, and that by a second and then a third even steeper rise in wages without any arrest of soaring prices; and the third rise, which was in June, was made retroactive as from March, a step that put all estimates of cost for the intervening period fatally out of gear. French money has by now lost so much of its value that figures hardly mean anything, but a few examples may bring home the state of the case. At the time of writing a man's greatcoat or suit costs round about 20,000 frs., or at the official rate of exchange 100*l*. A common crockery table service costs the same; a bridal silk nightdress 30*l*. An office boy, aged 14, with no more to do than stamp documents, gets 4,000 frs. or 20*l*. per month, while a first-class girl typist can command four times as much. All prices, wages, and commercial salaries suffer the same trend. A small electrical undertaking with twenty-eight employees has now an annual pay-roll of two million francs or nominally 10,000*l*. In Paris the price of gas has been doubled. Curiously enough, the value of sterling has not followed, at least closely, this dizzy ascent. For a long time the pound, officially pegged at 200 frs., was privately changed at from 450 to 600. Then, just before the withdrawal of the old notes of higher denomination, it sprang for a moment to 1,000, only to fall back afterwards to the neighbourhood of 325. For internal purposes, however, the franc, which both French and British governments wished to support, has been devaluated. Judged by the cost of life, its value must be considered for a few, but very few, things (e.g. theatre tickets) as halved, for others as divided by six, or eight, or ten. At St Jean de Luz this summer, pension at small hotels cost 500 frs. a day, at the second-best hotels 1,000, at the best 2,000 or nominally 10*l*. Classes which formerly lived comfortably on savings or pensions are ruined or deplete their capital by sales of whatever they possess. To eke out a livelihood, everyone traffics in whatever he can. In these circumstances the black market reigns supreme. Anything can be had, at a price. An English man of business in Paris, invited to dine by a wood merchant at his house near the capital, reckoned the cost of the meal at 7*l*. 10*s*. (1,500 frs.) per head. Not long ago

butter was sold in Bordeaux at 2*l.* 10*s.* per lb., and as lately as July had to be paid for at a farm where it was made at as much as half that rate. The peasants, in whom runs a strong streak of the traditional avarice often taken as a subject by Guy de Maupassant, have excessively low prices imposed on them. They naturally conceal as much food as they can. They are averse even to selling privately produce for notes in which their confidence is limited; food can more easily be obtained from them by bartering for it goods they have difficulty in buying. Since the liberation their decent standard of nourishment, mentioned above, has become almost indecent. Formerly they produced to sell; now, in the first place, themselves to eat. They have paper money enough and to spare. A simple shepherd in the Pyrenees thought he would buy a farm. The owner asked 1½ million francs. The notary charged with the negotiation and supposing the price prohibitive was astounded at his illiterate client showing him a barrel stuffed with 1,000-fr. notes, the proceeds of piloting parties across the mountains into Spain and to relative safety from the Germans. When the currency was changed, a Paris costerwoman presented herself at a bank with a box of notes. 'How much have you there?' she was asked. The good woman didn't know. 'You must know about how much.' 'No,' she said. 'You can count them. They weigh nine pounds.' It is impossible to deny that the French food ration since the liberation has been insufficient, or that the rationing administration has proved incompetent, or that plenty of food is procurable on the black market. The French do not take kindly to controls. M. Georges Duhamel, the brilliant French Academician, has stated that in Belgium, where there is less control of prices, the food and clothing situation is better than in France. Many French people think that food difficulties have been deliberately intensified by hostile underlings in order to provoke political discontent.

The blackest point in the French economic situation is that no real relief can be expected until transport is re-established and raw material becomes available again. M. Pineau, the energetic Minister of Food appointed in June last, determined to make a frontal attack on the black market in Paris and especially on the scandal of

restaurants supplying luxurious fare at from 5*l.* a head upwards while the mass of the population could only tighten its belt. Nevertheless, as the 'Figaro' wrote at the time, nothing can prevent food profiteering so long as food obtained by ration is insufficient. Only adequate transport, together with free importation, can bring down food prices by making the black market unprofitable; the restoration of manufacture depends equally on transport, plus a better supply of raw material. Both these desiderata seem sadly far off, although the release from the Allied pool of the French merchant navy, now put at 800,000 tons, is a pointer in the right direction. As M. Raoul Dautry, the very able Minister of Reconstruction, said to me at the end of June, the crux of the whole situation is coal. Railway engineers have accomplished marvels in repairing the great French bridges destroyed in the war, but without coal nothing can be made to work in the factories or repair shops feeding either railways or other trades. The French railway system now runs 155,000 kilometres per day: in 1938 the figure was 700,000. Virtually no glass is made in France to-day; drugs habitually administered by injection from glass ampoules have to be given by the mouth in pills. In no industry can the factories work at more than a fraction of their power. All this is due largely to lack of coal. Before the war France imported 35 per cent. of her coal. This source of supply is still cut off, and France's own coal production has heavily declined, owing partly to difficulties analogous with our own, but partly to the food situation, since to work well miners must eat well too. Coal must be carried too, and transport lacks. M. Dautry, when I saw him, was far from optimistic about the near future. Indeed it is hard to foresee any but a bitter and hungry winter ahead for France. By this mid-summer there has been no possibility of creating adequate stocks of fuel for Paris or the other great French cities.*

Sombre as this picture may seem, it is lit by points

* By the end of August, M. Pineau had obtained promises of substantial food supplies from abroad, and there was a winter prospect of coal imports amounting, together with France's own increased production, to 10 per cent. below the minimum required for the nation's needs: a vast improvement.

of hope. There is a French saying : ' Quand le bâtiment va, tout va.' Now a certain activity may be noticed in the building trade in Paris and elsewhere too. The movement may be tentative, but it exists. Round mid-summer a serious increase of motor traffic on main roads could be observed and when special permission has to be obtained for running a car as well as for buying petrol, this argues an increase in general business. In the south-west the petrol tank is often replaced by tubes of natural gas from the oil deposits in the Pyrenees just begun to be tapped before the war ; but permission for running still has to be obtained. There has been a marked increase in births during the war, especially among the middle classes, with a strong development of the paternal instinct : young fathers are proud, and are anxious to take a hand in tending the baby, which they do in all circumstances without any false shame. The return, still going forward, of prisoners of war and political deportees has filled the hearts of innumerable French families with rejoicing, and should before long begin to be felt also as an economic asset. Much desultory grumbling is heard about the unwillingness of the young men to work. Nevertheless the Centres of Technical Instruction started by M. Raoul Dautry, and said to be some hundred in number, are crowded with applicants, who receive a training stated on the authority of a British official expert to be superior to anything of the kind in England. Best of all is the spirit of the average Frenchman, as always easiest to observe in the provinces. No one denies the disillusionment after the liberation, the shortage of everything that formerly made life in France so agreeable to middle-class, peasant, and workman alike, or the uncertainty of the future. Yet no one blames the Allies for these ills. All look forward to getting out of the mess somehow. The mess is the aftermath of the occupation, and the joy of escaping from occupation and the hated occupier is such as to transfigure the French and give them patience to grapple with troubles now besetting them and yet to come. While cold and want must make the coming winter a period of keen anxiety, it may be hoped that once that corner is turned and when the end of the war in the Pacific has released shipping generally for trade, a return to normal life in France may be achieved. One excellently

placed observer in Paris has put to me the space of time needed for this as two years.

Besides economic and social troubles, France has soon to face a grave constitutional crisis. Since the collapse of 1940 there has been substantial agreement that an overhauling of the constitution of the Third Republic was inevitable. Neither General de Gaulle nor any other Frenchman with a right to speak has ever concealed or varied from this intention. It was understood that it should be put into effect by means of a Constituent Assembly to be elected so soon as the prisoners of war and deportees were home again and could take stock so as to vote intelligently. In various quarters, some even socialist, there is complaint that the municipal elections early this year were rushed on too fast and that voters, especially women, who voted for the first time, had no notion for what or for whom they were voting. The date announced for the election of the Constituent Assembly is October 21. But by the middle of the summer an important decision had been taken by the parties of the Left, that is, the Communists, the Socialists, and the M.R.P. or Mouvement Républicain Populaire, a party formed out of the remains of the Resistance that have not gone back to allegiance to former political parties. While the spirit of the Resistance still lives and breathes, the attempt to consolidate its former members in a serious party likely to be a healthy element in French reconstruction has not been successful. The Radicals and Socialists still remain the largest parties in France, with a substantial sprinkling of moderate conservatives to the right of the Radicals. The Communists, who from the extreme Left Wing, have been showing feverish, indeed spendthrift, energy that, it can hardly be doubted, is paid for by lavish funds from abroad. Their numbers have probably been much increased by discontent at the food and fuel situation not improving after the liberation. They are well trained in concealing their real objects. Again to quote the 'Figaro,' by far the best French paper at the moment :

'For the past dozen years, and more especially since the Liberation, French political life has been profoundly vitiated by the fact that political parties refuse to present themselves to the elector under their true image and rarely venture to

seem what they are. The art of equivocation, both in opinion and in intention, has become the principal method of political strategy. . . . The extreme Left, without in the least departing from its doctrine or its programme, has adopted the watch-words of the Right: "National Front, resurrection, French greatness."

Thousands of sheep-like small property-owners bleat the new Communist slogans without realising that their meaning in the minds of their originators is quite simply: 'Dictatorship by the Communist Party.' At the time of the liberation of Paris and under cover of it, there is said to have been a plot to seize the city government and declare a Soviet: happily this was scotched by the rapid arrival of General le Clerc, followed by General de Gaulle himself. Sometimes indeed the cloven hoof can be spied. A fraction of the Communist party styled 'the Communist International,' publishes a daily paper in Paris and tracts with such slogans as 'The liberation is no better than Hitler's Socialism' and 'Join the maquis again rather than join the army.'

The decision referred to above was that these parties should demand a single-chamber Constituent Assembly, elected *ad hoc* by direct vote, instead of one made up of a Chamber of Deputies and a Senate elected, with modifications, on the pattern of the Third Republic parliament. Their object is patently to obtain an assembly that can be stamped by panic, menace, or childish enthusiasm, and thus to inaugurate measures dear to revolutionary hearts. The Communists do not conceal that they want such an assembly not merely to draw up a constitution but also to legislate and even to govern as well, which would mean throwing the executive power into the hands of secret, extra-parliamentary, committees like the Jacobin club that dominated the Convention of 1793; and they have drawn into their orbit the self-baptised 'Etats Généraux de la Renaissance Française,' composed of hot-headed delegates from various former resistance groups. In a speech made during his triumphant progress through Auvergne at the beginning of July General de Gaulle made his position clear. 'I do not wish to govern against the will of the Resistance from which I have sprung,' he said; 'but I consider a single, sovereign assembly contrary to the interests of the Republic and of

democracy and, if this formula were to be adopted, I should have to take grave decisions.' In other words, if a Constituent Assembly composed of a single, omnipotent chamber were to be created, General de Gaulle would resign. He repeated this at the end of July at a sitting of the Consultative Assembly, which after high early hopes ended its career in a positive riot of inglorious futility.

In opposition to the idea of a single and sovereign constituent assembly, the Provisional Government produced a project to be submitted to the nation which, if slightly complicated, at least cannot be accused of being anti-democratic. Its essence is to put to a referendum the question of the form of the constituent assembly and also, seven months later, the constitution itself to be evolved by it. During the intervening months the country should be governed by a prime minister elected by the constituent assembly and by a cabinet chosen by and responsible to him. On July 12 General de Gaulle, in a broadcast speech of much simplicity and cogency and with still greater limpidity at Brest on July 21, gave his reasons for his attitude on the question. He was answered by his opponents in the press in a polemical style that bodes little good for France's political future if the electorate should not follow General de Gaulle's lead. The trials and enforced unity in resistance to the enemy during the occupation have plainly not deepened the wells of France's statecraft. The resignation of General de Gaulle, however, should be a prospect calculated to give pause even to hardened theorists. While criticism of the Provisional Government and of various ministers has not been spared, it is clear, if only from the Auvergne tour, that General de Gaulle has lost little of the passionate faith accorded him by an overwhelming majority of the French. The politicians of Paris are therefore in these dog days still trying to find a way of compromise. Whether or no they will succeed or, if they do not, can withdraw from the position they have taken up, time alone can show. More likely they hope to bully General de Gaulle into accepting their view. As others have found, he is a bad man to try and bully. All that can be said with certainty is that, were General de Gaulle to retire from public life, a period of great

weakness, perplexity, and perhaps violence must ensue. There is still much disorder in France to be corrected. In the days after the liberation men who had held posts in dangerous and lonely sections of the Resistance were imprisoned and sometimes shot by ruffians who had rushed into the F.F.I. at the very end. The Spanish republicans earned a specially unsavoury reputation. If political troubles now upset the applecart, all the dregs will come once more to the surface in local and arbitrary dictatorship. No one but General de Gaulle, among either the old or the new men, has shown the slightest signs of ability to drive the coach. It is unlikely that General de Gaulle will change his mind. Cautious in coming to decisions, when he sees his path clearly he sticks to it with absolute resolution. That indeed is why most Frenchmen place their belief in him.*

An example of General de Gaulle's unbending character comes close to us in the affairs of Syria which burst early last summer into a blaze that threatened to set the whole Middle East alight. It may be admitted that the policy of both British and French governments and the energy of their agents have been at fault. On our side it seems strange not to have recognised that while Arab and other Levantine nationalists welcomed the British as a stick to beat the French with, the moment the French were driven out a stick as thick would fall on our backs. Recrimination and perhaps even analysis of recent error can do no good at the present juncture. It may, however, be useful to bring the story as a whole into its true proportions, since these are obviously unknown to many. Continued ignorance of them might permanently injure the relations between Great Britain and France. Yet, as has often been insisted, such injury must not be allowed to take place, since upon a good understanding between the two countries the whole future of Europe depends. Even so, we owe it to the sincerity of the French feeling for England's part in the war that Anglo-French relations have not sunk back to the state from which Edward VII and his advisers lifted them.

* General de Gaulle's position should be strengthened by the success of his mission to America in August and by M. Herriot's belated call on August 27 to the Radicals to back the provisional government's constitutional project. Nevertheless a Communist victory cannot be excluded.

France's position in Syria and the Lebanon has roots going far back into history and intertwined with those of Great Britain's position in the Middle East.

Mr Winston Churchill, speaking on Feb. 27, 1945, in the House of Commons, said: 'The position of His Majesty's Government in respect of Syria and the Lebanon and in relation to our French allies . . . is governed by the statement made in 1941 in which the independence of these Levant States was definitely declared by Great Britain and France.' The Prime Minister omitted to say that the statement referred to contained the following phrase: 'When this essential step has been taken, and without prejudice to it, we freely admit that France should have the predominant position in Syria and the Lebanon over any other Power,' which admission is of course binding on Great Britain equally with the earlier part of the statement. Nor was the statement of 1941 the only or the first acceptance by us of an obligation towards France in that part of the world. The relations therein of the two powers, so far as the present-day world is concerned, goes farther back and must be traced from the date of the 1914-18 war. Nor can those relations be considered solely in connection with Syria and the Lebanon: they extend to and are contingent upon policy throughout the Middle East. If a muddle has arisen in them that at best is annoying and at worst might grow into a serious danger, this is in part due to the opportunist and at times contradictory political strategy pursued by Great Britain.

The origin of the matter lies in our natural and wholly laudable desire to detach the Arab States from the Ottoman Empire and join them to us in the war with Germany that broke out in 1914. To achieve that object we made promises to the Arab States amounting to assurance of complete independence for the whole of Arabia (except Aden) in return for military aid against the Turks. That assurance was contained in a letter dated Oct. 24, 1915, from Sir Henry McMahon on behalf of the British government to King Husain of the Hijaz, who was recognised as representing the Arabs. The Arabs fully performed their part of the bargain: no one doubted that. Their military aid was highly valuable, as Lord Allenby testified. Later it was attempted to be

argued that our assurances did not go so far as the Arabs had believed. The attempt failed lamentably. In the course of this manoeuvre it was found that no authentic copy of the operative letter had been preserved in London, and the question could be set at rest only by obtaining from the Amir Abdullah of Trans-Jordan (second son of King Husain) a photostatic copy of the document and by its examination here by competent authorities on the Arabic language. Which being done, it was pronounced beyond the possibility of doubt that the Arab interpretation of the British letter was correct, and that Great Britain had in fact promised the Arabs what they insisted that we had promised.

In the meantime the situation was complicated by two further events. In 1916 by a secret agreement, that became known from the names of the British and French negotiators as the Sykes-Picot agreement, between Great Britain, France, and Russia, this country recognised that France had a predominant interest in Syria and the Lebanon, while France recognised a predominant British interest in Irak, Trans-Jordan, and Palestine. The Sykes-Picot agreement ceased to be secret when it was published without our consent by the Russians after the Russian revolution of 1917 and Great Britain was thereby seen to have made contradictory promises to different parties concerned. Yet another contradictory obligation was incurred by this country when by the Balfour Declaration of 1917 it sponsored the scheme for 'a national home' for the Jews in Palestine. Not unnaturally the Jews maintained, and still maintain, that the Balfour Declaration invested them with the right to Palestine as a State of their own. Yet this ran flatly counter to our promises made to the Arabs in 1915.

After the war the Allied and Associated Powers in 1920 entrusted to France a Mandate over Syria and the Lebanon, under Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and the preamble of the Mandate stated that France exercised it in the name of the League. These mandated countries were in a state of endemic political unrest as the rebellion of 1920 in Irak showed, but, on the whole, the position of France turned out to be more difficult than that of Great Britain in the territories put under our mandate, not even excluding Palestine where

the situation as between Arab and Jew, however tense, was at least clear-cut. After many ups and downs, among others military operations not always favourable to the French, it was agreed in principle that Syria and the Lebanon should assume sovereign powers, contingent on the conclusion with France of a Treaty of Friendship and Alliance much on the model of those between Great Britain and Irak and Egypt. This should guarantee to France the predominant interest that Great Britain had recognised in 1916 as the counterpart of our predominant interest elsewhere.

In September 1936 a treaty was accordingly negotiated and initialed in Paris giving full autonomy to Syria and the Lebanon, subject to the provisions of a military convention enabling France to maintain troops in certain areas. The treaty was signed in Beirut on Nov. 13, 1936, and four days later ratified by the Lebanese parliament. When, however, it came after much delay before the French parliament in 1938, the Chamber which, it should be remarked, was preponderantly Radical and Socialist, refused to ratify it. Nothing further was done before the outbreak of war next year which naturally postponed a solution of the question still further. On the capitulation of the Pétain usurping government to Germany, Syria, under the control of the Vichyite General Dentz, became a hotbed of German air technicians and agents of all sorts, so dangerous that in order to safeguard the whole Allied Middle East front from collapse the country had to be occupied in 1941 by British and Fighting French forces. On behalf of General de Gaulle and the French National Committee, General Catroux, in a proclamation to Syria and the Lebanon, announced: 'I come to put an end to the Mandatory regime and to proclaim you free and independent. You will therefore be from henceforward sovereign and independent peoples. . . . Your independence and sovereignty will be guaranteed by a treaty in which our mutual relations will be determined.'

When these facts are considered, it will be seen that the French position in the Levant—where it is noteworthy that France's spiritual and cultural interests go back to the Middle Ages—becomes clear. The promised end of the French Mandate is contingent, just as was the result

hoped to be obtained from the abortive treaty of 1936, on the signature of a special convention between France and the Mandated territories. Now the Syrians and the Lebanese wish to obtain the result without paying the stipulated price for it. They want not to have a treaty with France at all. They hope to profit by the weakness of France during the last five years to get rid of her altogether in despite of the international obligations undertaken by the Allied and Associated Powers in 1916 and 1920 and ever since properly observed by France, and of their own undertakings in 1936. They want both to have their cake and to eat it.

The position of France is unattackable. On grounds of juridical origin, she is in the Levant on precisely the same footing as Great Britain is in the other mandated areas of the Middle East. For this country to admit that France is not there of right would be tantamount to the admission that neither have we any right to a special position in Irak, Trans-Jordan, or Palestine. Our cases are on all fours, save indeed that we have made a number of contradictory promises whereas the French have acted strictly under the terms of their Mandate. Moreover, in the hardly conceivable event of our being willing to sacrifice that position, the outcome would present no benefit to the countries concerned. If France and Great Britain were to pull, root and branch, out of the Levant and the Middle East, the only possible result would be a massive infiltration into that important part of the world of Russian influence in its latest Sovieto-Imperialist avatar. It is for the people of the British Empire to think if this is what they want. If they do not, Great Britain cannot fail to support France in the Levant, and use her good offices to secure a satisfactory agreement between France and the two Arab States concerned.

It would be idle to deny that the attitude of Mr Churchill's government on the Syrian question came as a shock to most Frenchmen. The man in the street felt he was being bullied; those responsible for affairs tended to ascribe Mr Churchill's words and deeds to a deep-seated strategic policy on the part of England, and found it hard to believe that personalia weighed heavily in the balance. Nonetheless, it is true that the French success-

fully restrained their feelings. The extent of the French concessions and the calmer atmosphere that succeeded the flare-up warrant the hope that this cape of difficulty may be rounded. All serious-minded Frenchmen are convinced that Europe can be saved only through close co-operation between their country and ours. Another evidence of French restraint is furnished by the slight public reaction to the bloody attack inspired by Communist agitators last June on a train of Spanish consular officials passing through Chambéry. Even in the Pyrenees close to the Spanish border small interest was taken in the affair and the blatant attempt to stir up trouble between France and Spain failed of its object. In the domain of foreign policy there need therefore be but little apprehension for France. Her difficulties and dangers lie in the sphere of industrial and economic development and in that of sheer internal politics. Time alone can show how successfully she can grapple with them.

JOHN POLLOCK.

Art. 2.—REORGANISATION OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE.

REFORMS are often no more than the formal register of growth or decay, the official recognition of altered conditions. They stabilise and coordinate changes that have already been made by day-to-day practice. In spite of the present high-pressure activity of planners we still in this country for the most part believe in the spontaneous growth of institutions, regulated and checked by the lopping off of branches which have been ruined by abuse or decay. The Foreign Office and Diplomatic Service offer a good example of this normal British process. They have been growing steadily since Charles James Fox became the first Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in 1782; during the last half-century expansion and change have been particularly rapid. Perhaps I may be allowed to give an illustration from the career of my father, who retired from the Diplomatic Service in 1905. He was

taken into it without having had to pass a competitive examination ; he served for forty-eight years ; except for his first six months, when he was a young attaché, he spent no period of the forty-eight years inside the Foreign Office ; and he retired at the age of sixty-nine. Not one of those four simple statements of fact could be made of any of His Majesty's servants in the Foreign Service to-day. None can enter it without overcoming the keen rivalry of other aspirants in a stiff oral and written examination (though in the exceptional circumstances of the immediate after-war period the competitive form of the test is being temporarily modified, as it was in 1919-20). Nobody can serve for forty-eight years, nor up to the age of sixty-nine, on account of the strange rule which makes a man too old to continue in the Foreign Service after he is sixty—though he may be a general at the front, or a Prime Minister, or the director of world-wide industrial concerns long after he has passed that age-limit ! * And finally, nobody can spend the whole of his career abroad, because a salutary correction now insists that a member of the Foreign Service shall sit periodically at a Foreign Office desk and see how the machine is operated at the centre. My father used to complain that it was extremely difficult to keep in touch with opinion at home, though he was allowed, when not at a distant post, to take two months or ten weeks' holiday in England. This was impossible, of course, when he was Minister in Chile, and there, it may be mentioned, he had no staff at all—my mother used to act as his amanuensis and copy out his despatches for him. Even in Bucharest he only had one officer under him, Mr Hamilton Browne, who combined the post of Vice-Consul with that of a 'local' Second Secretary, Mr Browne not being a regular member of His Majesty's Diplomatic Service. To-day one of these posts carries ambassadorial rank and both are provided with secretaries, attachés, translators, and typists.

And in the posts where an adequate staff was maintained the ambassador of those days was the head of a

* Among British Prime Ministers, Palmerston, Beaconsfield, Gladstone, Salisbury, and Churchill have held their office after passing the age of seventy. Talleyrand and Clemenceau held high offices when they were octogenarians.

family, knowing each member of it intimately, and seeing one or more almost daily at his luncheon or dinner table. Lord Bertie, who retired at the end of the 1914-18 war, was the last ambassador to preside over such a diplomatic family in Paris; the swollen staffs of his successors have usually not all been known by sight to his successors. And gradually the ambassador has come to be less the personal representative of his own Sovereign to the Sovereign or Chief of State to whom he is accredited (though such is still his official standing); he is now in many posts becoming to a greater degree the representative of his own people to the people of the country where he resides. In Washington several public men, like Lord Bryce, have gone about among the people of America and delivered addresses on every kind of topic in a manner which would have horrified Lord Lyons, who after the close of his successful mission as British Minister there in the sixties declared that he had 'never taken a drink or made a speech.' Perhaps the final change-over may be dated from the moment when Lord Lothian succeeded Sir Ronald Lindsay in the early years of the second German war. Sir Ronald had been an efficient, far-seeing and most successful envoy of the government-to-government type; Lord Lothian (whose first diplomatic post it was) made himself a public figure in the United States and welcomed the unceremonious visits of Congressmen and journalists at all times. This example of making frequent public appearances has been followed by Lord Halifax, and will certainly be regarded as a normal duty for Britain's future representatives in the American capital.

Diplomatic staffs have been enlarged not only by an ampler supply of Secretaries but especially by an increase in the number of specialists. In addition to the Naval, Military, and Air Attachés there are now Commercial Attachés, Financial Attachés, Press Attachés, and in some cases Labour and even Agricultural Attachés. Sir Victor Wellesley suggests * that Scientific, Industrial, and Mineralogical Attachés may soon have to be added. The purely political character of the major Embassies has thus already

* In 'Diplomacy in Fetters,' which was the subject of an article in the last issue of the 'Quarterly Review.'

been profoundly modified. The new Chief of Mission abroad is not so much the father of a diplomatic family as the head of a large business concern with wide ramifications. He cannot be expected to have an expert knowledge of all the activities of his staff. He must rather be a supervisor, coordinator, and director of their activities, the leader and man of sure judgment who controls specialists, much as the Prime Minister, drawn from the ranks of Parliament, commands the work of the various Departments of State.

This multiplication of experts should enable the Chief of Mission to free himself from day-to-day tasks in his study and to move about the country, to make himself acquainted with the various characteristics and phases of its national life, to get to know public men in the provinces as well as in the capital, and to carry about with him and transmit to them the ideas and the goodwill of his own native land. But he must be able to go on his occasional travels without losing the direction of his own team in the capital; for it is all-important that the labours of multiplied experts should be centrally sifted and coordinated and directed; otherwise the new lines of activity may lead to disintegration of policy.

The tendencies already described by no means exhaust the range of changes already introduced into the organisation of British policy and representation abroad. The very name has been changed. There is no longer a Diplomatic Service, a Commercial Diplomatic Service, a Consular Service, an exclusive Foreign Office—Mr Eden merged them all into a single Foreign Service in 1943. That embraces also the special Attachés who have already been enumerated; and the personnel of the various different branches is interchangeable. Any member of any section may aspire to be appointed a Chief of Mission. An ambassadorship is no longer the prerogative of the professional diplomatist. A good example of the working of the new system was the appointment last June of the Commercial Minister in Buenos Aires to take supreme charge of the Legation in Stockholm.

The changes already set out do not complete the list. The field from which candidates are recruited has been widened, and so far from the aspiring diplomatist being expected to possess a certain secure income from his

private resources,* the State is henceforward to provide him with the means of going abroad and gaining the necessary knowledge of foreign languages. The obvious objection to this particular innovation is that it must always be difficult to decide, before a man is twenty-five, whether he has the special qualifications required for diplomacy; and it is questionable whether any Government is justified in making special provision for assisting a man into a public Department—even though another new regulation authorises retirement on pension at an earlier age than heretofore. It is, to say the least, uneconomic that the State shall use the taxpayer's money to put a man into the Foreign Service and then spend more of the public funds, if he proves to be a misfit, to take him out again.

An unheralded but important change that has taken place within the Foreign Office is the greater influence which its Permanent Head now exercises upon policy. The function of the Foreign Office Staff used to be solely clerical and executive. Up to the earlier part of Lord Sanderson's period of office, the Permanent Under-Secretary was an administrator and the mere executant of the policy already prescribed by the Foreign Secretary. Lord Palmerston and Lord Salisbury conceived and imposed their own course of action, after discussion in the Cabinet, but without any kind of consultation with any member, however highly placed, of their own Department. Sheer pressure of work has altered that. A modern Foreign Secretary cannot keep himself well versed by his own study in all the varied problems of to-day. He has to rely to a much greater degree on the special research and on the advice of his subordinates. The first tentative steps in that direction were taken by Lord Lansdowne, who freely consulted Sir Eyre Crowe, Sir Charles Hardinge, and other of his senior advisers. Then in 1906 these two officials formally introduced the far-reaching reform of encouraging all members of the Foreign Office, however lowly their rank, to minute papers which came before them with their own observations upon policy. Thus before the document reached the Permanent Under-

* Before 1914 a candidate for the Diplomatic Service, though not for the Foreign Office, was expected to have a private income of not less than 400*l.* a year.

Secretary or the Deputy-Under-Secretary it might have three or four suggestions in the margin ; and one of these would probably make a culminating proposal before it went to the Foreign Secretary. Under present conditions, especially in war-time, when the Foreign Secretary has been absent on voyages abroad, the Permanent Under-Secretary has had to make urgent representations on his own responsibility—though presumably he takes no major decision without consulting the Prime Minister, or if he is also absent, the responsible Cabinet Minister. Sir Alexander Cadogan, who enjoyed the personal confidence of Mr Churchill as well as of his immediate Chief, and who formed an invaluable link between Mr Eden and Mr Bevin at Potsdam, has probably had more constant influence on British policy than any of his predecessors ; while the Deputy-Under-Secretary, Sir Orme Sargent, is also mainly occupied with pure politics. Simultaneously with their increased concern with policy has come a diminished attention to administrative affairs. A special personnel Department of the Foreign Office has taken all routine business, even recommendations for promotion and new appointments, off their hands.

Besides relieving the Foreign Secretary of work which is beyond the capacity of one mind to deal with satisfactorily, the absorption of the Under-Secretary in policy also has another important and beneficial result—it ensures greater continuity of policy. Foreign Secretaries come and go, Conservative succeeds to Liberal, and Socialist to Conservative, but the Under-Secretary and his Staff remain. The Under-Secretary may not be so ' permanent ' as his title indicates ; but he and his colleagues in the Office are not personally affected by Party changes and Government ; and the increased authority of the whole Foreign Office in regard to policy must exercise a salutary check upon any light-hearted attempt by an incoming Government to reverse the policy of its predecessor.

Greater continuity of foreign policy is much on the lips of the reformers, and during the General Election in the summer approval of the principle was expressed by the responsible leaders of the three Parties, while the extremists of the Left, among whom was Sir Stafford Cripps, vigorously dissented from it. There must indeed

be occasions when a new Government disagrees with the foreign policy of its predecessor—twenty years ago Mr Baldwin's Government reversed the attitude of the Labour Government both towards Soviet Russia and to the Geneva Protocol; honesty must often compel the change. But as a common practice, sudden change in foreign policy is strongly to be deprecated. Variations in British policy gave France in by-gone days the excuse to hurl at us the taunt of Perfidie Albion and provided Bismarck with the pretext for declaring that it was useless to make an agreement with a British Government which would probably be disowned by its successor. It is in every way desirable that Britain should pursue an agreed and consistent foreign policy up to the very limit of honourable unanimity. Here again much has been quietly achieved. In addition to the enhanced political importance of the Permanent Under-Secretary, already mentioned, it has become customary for the Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary of the day to impart communicable secrets of foreign affairs to the leaders of the Opposition; and the close connection between Foreign Policy and Defence is recognised in the full freedom of discussion allowed to the Committee of Imperial Defence, with all relevant secret information in possession of its members, and in the authority which they enjoy to summon any official whose personal testimony they wish to hear.

With most of the speech on foreign affairs which Mr Bevin made at Blackpool to the Labour Conference in May, Mr Eden would have agreed, and Mr Attlee went with Mr Churchill to Berlin in July. But some of the reformers, notably Sir Victor Wellesley, consider that a still wider measure of parliamentary unity is necessary and advocate the formation of a parliamentary Foreign Affairs Committee, consisting of members of both Houses and of all Parties. In my opinion the obvious attraction of this expedient is heavily outweighed by its less obvious disadvantages. The Committee would in fact be performing a duty which properly belongs to the whole House. It would have to be entrusted with secret information; and why should secret information be imparted to some members and not to others? Moreover, the secrets would almost inevitably go farther, with unhappy consequences. It would be particularly dangerous to impart

the secret if (as instanced by Lord Hankey in a recent article) it concerned some fatal weakness, known to our Government, in the defence system of our actual or prospective ally. Confidences must always be given and taken in international affairs, just as in the transaction of ordinary business ; and such information has often been imparted on the express understanding that it is given to one man alone and for his personal guidance. The more secret information a British Foreign Secretary can acquire, the better for Britain. There will always be a personal element in diplomacy, just as there is in political journalism ; the well-trusted man will learn more than a new acquaintance, and almost any one man will have more confided to him than a group of men. The Foreign Secretary is likely to gain less confidential information if it becomes his known duty to pass it on to a group of parliamentarians, many of them, perhaps, politically opposed to the original impartor of the secret.

The British public have a well-founded dislike of privileged coteries and of secrecy among parliamentarians. Publicity is indeed the vitalising blood-stream of the parliamentary body. Nor could a Foreign Affairs Committee properly be entrusted with responsibility. The responsibility for policy must always wholly devolve upon the Government of the day. It cannot be divided or delegated.

And the final objection which I urge is that the constant appearance before a Parliamentary Committee would further overtask the already too heavily burdened Foreign Secretary. I have watched with compassion the operation of this system in France. There the Senate had its Foreign Affairs Committee as well as the Chamber of Deputies ; and I have seen a Foreign Minister obliged to defend his policy on the same issue four times within the space of three days—once each to the two Committees, and then again in turn to the two Houses. And the members of the Committees were known to have been even more harassing in their cross-examination than the full Houses. No wonder the Ministers of the Third Republic found it difficult to stay the course. I regard the French system of several different Committees of the two Houses as a contributory reason why so very few French Governments in this century have lasted for

two years. The Ministers become quickly worn out. Admittedly, the practice would in all probability not be pushed to extremes in London ; but, as it appears to me to be of the utmost importance that the Foreign Secretary should have wider authority and less personal, detailed work, I hope this extra burden will never be thrust upon him.

There can, in short, be little doubt that this Continental practice would long ago have been introduced here if members of Parliament had not had an instinctive feeling that it was contrary to British habit and custom. An illustration of how quickly, steadily, and surely practices grow up which are congenial to us is afforded by the increasing collaboration in foreign policy between ourselves and the Dominions. The reformers all press for closer collaboration ; and how few of them refer to the existence of the Dominions Intelligence Department or mention the fact that a high British Foreign Office official is at the disposal of the Dominion representatives in London, to answer any questions about which they desire information. And, as Lord Cranborne mentioned in the House of Lords last year, he himself, accompanied by the Member of the Foreign Office, who is Sir Basil Newton, used to meet the High Commissioners regularly for the purpose of expounding and discussing British policy. It would be still more useful that the Secretary of State should himself, if he can find the time, hold regular meetings with them. Moreover there is a growing interchange of the personnel of the Dominion Diplomatic Services and our own ; members of the United Kingdom's Foreign Service have done spells of service in the Ministries for External Affairs in Dominion capitals ; and young diplomatists from the Dominions are following the example set by Mr. R. G. Casey after the 1914-18 war and taking temporary posts in the United Kingdom's Foreign Service. The rapid growth of the Dominions' Foreign Services sets a problem which it must be confessed has not yet been fully resolved. The more self-provided their diplomatic information becomes, the greater must be the tendency for each overseas Government to form its own estimate of foreign events ; and it can be easily imagined that in some cases a crisis in Tokyo, for example, might be very differently judged in Canberra, in London, and in Ottawa.

But *solvitur ambulando*. The almost daily meetings in Whitehall, the mutual familiarity with each other's views obtained by temporary domicile in each other's capitals, check the tendency to drift apart; and though ultimately more formal and more regular meetings may with advantage be arranged between the leaders, the Prime Ministers who attended last year's Conference in London all declared that they were kept adequately informed on the foreign situation; and since then they have met again at San Francisco.

In that respect, as in most others, what is wanted is vigilance and constant modification of arrangements to meet new practices and possibilities—in short, reorganisation rather than reform. There is common agreement that the Foreign Office must to-day keep in closer touch with economics and commerce than was usual in the past. And here too the process of growth is visible. After the 1914–18 war the Department of Overseas Trade became a part of the Foreign Office; after this one the operating remnant of the Ministry of Economic Warfare is likewise being absorbed; and it is proposed, as Lord Cranborne announced in the House of Lords last December, that the Foreign Office shall contain a 'Foreign Economic Intelligence Department,' which shall collate information as to economic developments in foreign countries.

A more formal liaison may also have to be established between the Foreign Office and the Treasury and the Bank of England (now in process of being nationalised). In recent years the title of 'Head of the Civil Service' which the Permanent Under-Secretary at the Treasury is allowed *ex officio suo* to assume, gave him some kind of right of interference inside the Foreign Office which was bitterly and rightly resented by its members. That was the worst imaginable form of liaison between these two State Departments; and it is satisfactory that Lord Cranborne, in answer to a question put by Lord Perth in the House of Lords, made it clear that the personnel of the Foreign Service owe no allegiance to the Head of the Treasury. But there were occasions during the 1919–39 period when divergences appeared between the policies of the Foreign Office and of the Treasury and Board of Trade. Mr Philip Snowden at The Hague took a line about the French attitude to reparations which greatly upset the Foreign

Office; Mr Montagu Norman's financial policy towards Germany caused it embarrassment and annoyance; and the Board of Trade often set out to capture markets for Britain quite regardless of causing unemployment in those countries and consequent ill-will against Britain.

There should certainly be created a centralised direction which prevents such divergences of policy. Constitutionally the Cabinet should suffice. But the evidence of those who have experience of its meetings seems to show that discussions between Departments of State are abhorred. 'The one thing,' wrote Mr Amery in 1934,* 'that is hardly ever discussed is general policy.' Points that must immediately be settled apparently press everything else out of view. Sir Victor Wellesley therefore urges that a central Advisory Board be created, on which should be represented the Heads of the various Departments concerned, and over which the Permanent Under-Secretary of the Foreign Office should preside. Its recommendations should then be passed to a similar body at Ministerial level, by which decisions would be taken, subject only to the approval of the whole Cabinet. Whether this would provide the necessary 'Thinking Shop' for the Cabinet it is difficult for anybody to judge who has not had personal experience of government. Lord Cranborne, in the House of Lords, only suggested that the Foreign Office 'should be an efficient partner in the formulation of Government policy as regards the economic, commercial, and political aspects of international affairs.' That does not carry us much farther. A more positive proposal, which deserves serious consideration, is that a Minister should, under the Foreign Secretary, preside over a greatly enlarged Economic and Commercial Department of the Foreign Office, and that the Board of Trade should revert to its normal and proper status as the Department of State concerned mainly with internal trade and industry.

Another important point on which the new Government must make up its mind is where control of the European Division of the B.B.C. is going to be vested. The decision has been taken that the broadcasts in foreign language, which were so valuable in sustaining the

* Quoted by Sir Victor Wellesley.

courage of the occupied peoples of Europe during the war, shall be continued in time of peace; the all-important question of control has not been settled at the time of writing (August 1). In war the political direction came from the Foreign Office. I was the Diplomatic Correspondent of the European Division from 1942 till Easter, 1945. It was my business to keep in close touch with the Foreign Office; and I can bear witness that it was possible, without expecting a fresh statement of policy from its officials every day, faithfully and continuously to expound the British semi-official view to foreign listeners. This function will be just as desirable in peace-time. The wireless offers a unique means of speaking direct to the people of a foreign country—a true instrument of democratic diplomacy. It will be freely used—it is already being used and abused—by foreign Governments. The British Government cannot afford alone to remain dumb. On the air it can speak to foreigners each in his own tongue; it can reach across frontiers, and defy censorship—for instance, when Russia, while freely broadcasting herself to every European country and sending newspaper correspondents where she liked, refused to allow foreign newspaper men to enter States occupied by her armies in Rumania, Bulgaria, Austria, Hungary, and eastern Germany, the radio overrode her prohibitions, and, to the undoubted satisfaction of the governments concerned, maintained daily contact between them and London.

The alternative to the continuation of the full European Service under governmental direction is that the British Broadcasting Corporation should operate it on a much diminished scale and on its own responsibility. There are several objections. The B.B.C. authorities are apt to think of the European Division as a side-show of war-time; and the reduction of its service from twenty-four to four or five foreign languages, as at present proposed, would cut off from its day-to-day narration and interpretation of events precisely those countries in eastern Europe which are badly placed for maintaining their connection with the West. Moreover, the B.B.C. is properly insistent on its independence of Whitehall; and its method is controversy. Its technique is to promote and provoke discussion. It caters for the British taste to 'hear both sides.' It has no policy. Its Charter forbids it to have

a policy of its own, and it refuses to be the servant of the government. It is therefore by its constitution and practice unsuited to convey to foreign listeners the opinion of the British Government. And that is precisely, in my opinion, what every political-minded European will wish to hear in the trouble years that lie ahead. He will be confused by the contradictory arguments that will reach him on the ether from every direction. There will not only be the differences of opinion within his own country (though he may not always be allowed to hear these on the air), there will also be the opinions of other Governments—which they will do their best to make him hear—and from the British Isles, if he can understand English, will come the varied views expressed on our Home Service, some friendly to the official policy, some critical of it.

If Britain is to exercise that steadying influence which will be the greatest service she can render to foreign countries during the next decade she must put forth on the air day by day the quiet statement of the British view, semi-officially, and in as many languages as possible. That should be an integral part of the new democratic diplomacy. The British case must never again be allowed to go by default. And in order to distinguish the officially sponsored service from that of the independent B.B.C., it might appropriately be called the B.B.D.—British Broadcasting Department: a Department, that is, of the British Foreign Service.

Linked with it for the diffusion of British ideas abroad will be the British Council. Never has the world been so eager to know Britain well. Europe is still amazed at our single-handed resistance to all-conquering Hitler; and it wants to learn the secret of our strength. To understand the English language is the first need of foreigners who wish to understand England; and this knowledge the British Council is especially well qualified to supply. Between the work of the Council and of the British radio, though akin, there is a clear difference—whereas the emphasis of the Broadcasting Department will be on political guidance, the emphasis of the Council is on British culture. The fact that it is non-political, however, cannot remove it entirely from official supervision. It received a grant of 3,500,000*l.* in 1945–46 from the Treasury, of which 2,900,000*l.* was borne on the Foreign Office vote

and the remainder on that of the Colonial Office. Parliament and the Government cannot therefore divest themselves of responsibility as to how the money is spent. Under its Charter the Secretaries of State for Foreign Affairs, the Dominions, the Colonies, and Scotland each appoint one of the thirty members of the Executive Committee, in whom all the powers of the British Council are vested. This typical British compromise safeguards official supervision while allowing wide latitude to its various committees. The Council has greatly flourished since the late Lord Lloyd became its Chairman in 1937, and during the war its activities and expenditure have increased by leaps and bounds—it spent a little over half-a-million pounds in 1941–42, and is spending seven times that sum to-day. Its immediate need is to obtain a building which can suitably provide the necessary central accommodation for its widely ranged and increasingly solicited contacts.

And what is true of the British Council is true in the still more important case of the Foreign Office building. As surely as the demands of the Service had outgrown the old Foreign Office at the end of the Crimean War, so to-day its new and expending Departments require vastly greater and more convenient accommodation. Sir Walford Selby, who served as Principal Private Secretary to five Secretaries of State at the Foreign Office in succession, and therefore knows its inner working intimately, has written that the present building 'can in no circumstances meet these (new) requirements.' * Perhaps, if the future status of the Indian Empire demands a new and single headquarters for India in London, that adjoining portion of the imposing Whitehall quadrangle which at present serves the India Office might with advantage be handed over to the Foreign Office and the merged buildings drastically transformed. Or it might be considered appropriate to take over the whole of Carlton House Terrace.

As with all authentic English institutions, the growth of the Foreign Office has been natural, gradual, and, as we have seen, continuous. It has now 29 Departments; and the latest development, the crude amalgamation of all its branches into one Foreign Service, cause the unified organi-

* 'Nineteenth Century,' July 1945.

sation to be amorphous, and, in its shapelessness, unwieldy. Some of the new departments are half in and half out of it. Part of the Ministry of Economic Warfare has been taken into it, and part of the Ministry of Information is in process of being absorbed. The British Council now has a representative of the Foreign Office on most of its Committees ; a section of Chatham House—the Research Section—has been merged in the Foreign Office ; the European Division of the B.B.C., after having been under its political direction, is slipping away from it, and ought to be reintegrated as soon as possible. These extraneous departments lie scattered about London, and should be pulled together and housed under the same roof as the Minister who will be responsible for them. It is probable, and most desirable, that a new and much enlarged Information Department be formed, which should include the existing News Department, a Department of Overseas Publicity, the remnant of the Ministry of Information, the transferred section of the Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House), and which should direct all semi-official broadcasting and supervise the work of the British Council. That would of course include the broadcasting by Morse, which already provides a semi-official multi-directional news service, greatly appreciated and much used in distant centres such as Cairo, Sydney, and the West Indies, where news from Britain is eagerly sought but is not always available on a commercially profitable basis. And the Information Department must have at its head one of the senior and most capable officials of the Foreign Service.

The moment has in fact come when the whole Foreign Office must undergo a formal process of massive and ordered enlargement, conforming to developments which modern needs have produced, but which have not yet been properly coordinated under one directing mind. And the relation of the Foreign Office to certain other of the great Departments of State remains to be defined and regulated in such a way that foreign policy is centrally and not haphazardly directed. This may involve the creation of the special inter-Ministerial Committee, as advocated by Sir Victor Wellesley, but the needed coordination can probably be effected in the Committee of Imperial Defence, which public men of such wide experience as Lord Hankey

and Lord Templewood consider well adapted to the purpose.

Changes have been promised by the National Government, and the sooner they are carried out the better. But whatever method be adopted, and however thorough the technical reorganisation may be, the supreme need will always be that the Foreign Secretary should, under the Prime Minister and Cabinet, be in sole and undisputed charge of foreign policy, and should have the leisure to attend without undue stress to its multifarious ramifications. To discharge his responsibility adequately, he must have a larger personal Staff, a greater number of senior associates to whom he can delegate the execution of his ideas. Mr Eden had already had the help of Ministers of Cabinet rank, like Mr Law ; and in Mr Churchill's so-called Caretaker Government he was given the assistance of the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Sir Arthur Salter) as well as of Mr Mabane as Minister of State. Furthermore, he had two Parliamentary Under-Secretaries for Foreign Affairs, instead of the usual one ; while Mr Spencer Summers was Parliamentary Under-Secretary for the Foreign Office Department of the D.O.T. To-day Mr Bevin has Mr Noel-Baker to help him in the capacity of a Minister of State with Cabinet rank. But the more complete and the more complex the machine, the greater is the need, when that mechanism consists of human beings, of an animating influence to prevent it from sinking into the lethargic habits of mere bureaucracy. If in the formative years that lie ahead Britain is to play the directive, moderating, and sometimes decisive part which Castlereagh, Palmerston, Clarendon, and Salisbury played after earlier wars in Europe, the British Foreign Secretary must be free to devote himself unreservedly to his history-making task and be able to bring to every problem as it arises freshness of mind, the drive of leadership, and an undivided authority.

A. L. KENNEDY.

[For the postscript to the above article see p. 504.]

Art. 3.—A NEW DEAL FOR COAL.

TO-DAY the citizens of Great Britain own the coal measures. There is one royalty owner—the State; or put in another way, there are some forty-six million owners. Correctly speaking, the man in the street is the coal owner. He leases his coal to the colliery owners who employ the miners. It is no exaggeration to say that he is profoundly dissatisfied at the way his property is being administered; as a rule he takes no side because he feels that something has gone wrong, and that the two partners in the industry are not pulling properly together. What he demands is a new deal for coal.

It is not everyone who would choose coal mining as an occupation. It is a hard life; it is carried on under conditions of darkness, dampness, intense heat, and ever present danger. Coal is our greatest national asset and it is also extremely difficult to win. The combination of these two circumstances should result in the coal miner being the highest paid operative in the land. However, before the war there were some eighty odd classes of workmen earning higher wages for a less strenuous occupation. In many cases therefore parents advised their sons to avoid the mines. In the older fields, coal mining was largely a hereditary profession—son followed father and grandfather down the pit, and what is more, took a pride in his calling. But the uncertainty of employment, the low wages, and the inherent dangers caused a falling off in the numbers of the younger generation who wished to adopt mining as a career.

Every industrialist knows that a contented workman will do a better job than one who has a grievance. The latter will not give of his best, and there will be stoppages which lead to a disappearance of profits and a loss of markets. A policy of reduced wages and longer hours is very short-sighted. Conditions of employment should therefore conform to this formula—that at the end of a day's work a man must have enough money, enough leisure, and enough energy for him to enjoy himself. It is not enough to pay a man so that he may live, he must be paid so that he can appreciate his life. The miner must, therefore, be paid the highest wage possible; the

rate must be in accordance with the value of the product and the nature of the work. Secondly, if hours are too long, then the man has not enough spare time. Hours, therefore, must be the shortest that are economically possible; whether the work should be concentrated into the five-day week is, of course, a matter of arrangement between the management and the men. Thirdly, if the work is too arduous, the man will have no energy left. Accordingly, every form of mechanisation must be employed down the pit and, in particular, men must be transported to and from the coal face. There must be no opposition to the introduction of machinery on the part of the men, as there has been on occasions in the past. The fear in this has been, not that the machine will oust the man, but that the management will so adjust the piece rates as alone to profit from the increased output. In nearly every case, however, the relations between the manager and the men's representatives are so friendly that these adjustments can be made round the table in a thoroughly amicable manner.

Such a formula can only work if output is maintained or increased. With a falling output as exists to-day it is impossible. What then is the cause of this falling output? In the first place the best men joined the forces, and others went into munitions. There is a shortage of labour. It is not true to say that it is due to the higher proportion of older men in the pits; the older men, in striking contrast to the young men, have worked magnificently during the war. P.A.Y.E. income tax has been blamed. This is very probable. No one likes paying income tax, and the miner coming under it for the first time feels there is a catch in it, and is tempted to restrict his output. But taking it all round, the ordinary miner is not working as hard as he can because there is no incentive for him to do so. This is the crux of the problem. The miner can take a day off when he likes, as he can still earn sufficient. There is no point in earning extra money because there is no immediate object upon which to spend it. He cannot buy clothes for his wife, as her coupons are used up: there are no toys for his children. In fact for a number of years there has been mighty little in the shops for him to buy. Now the miner is a very human individual, and he is not going to work, day after day, flat out, to earn a bit

extra to put by against a rainy day. Would any of us sweat our guts out in a hot, damp, dark, and dirty mine, hundreds of feet below the surface, and probably under the sea, in order to buy some Saving Certificates? Of course we should not. The incentive must be something tangible and immediate.

Any visitor to an American mine is struck by the number of cars he sees at the pithead. They belong to the miners. A manager once told me that parking space was becoming one of his main problems. Many a time I have had a lift in a car from the pit driven by a miner who had just completed a shift. Pithead baths being a rarity in U.S.A. the men get into their cars and drive home. I look forward to the day when the motor car is something which a British miner can expect to own himself. I hope to see a miner approaching the management and negotiating terms for the purchase of a car—the man with a good record will take possession after paying a deposit, and the rest will be deducted as an off-take from his pay-sheet at an agreed rate. Here is a double incentive—the incentive for the miner to increase his output and for the management to offer generous terms of hire-purchase.

Critics will say that this is merely a trick to get the men to work harder and thus increase profits. Of course it is. I believe in the profit motif, but such a system would work equally well under nationalisation, though I cannot believe the terms offered by the State would be as liberal as those of a Private Company. No doubt Socialists would object. They would find that their glib promises carried less weight with an audience which arrived in its own car, rather than one which had to queue for a 'bus. But the point is to increase production. If the miner by hewing more coal can begin to own a motor car, clearly he is satisfied; so is the employer if he is receiving an adequate reward on his capital. The nation must have sufficient coal for its own needs, and only a greatly increased output will enable us to export coal so as to pay for essential imports.

When I was in U.S.A. in 1926-27, the employers were making vast profits. The miners certainly did not grudge them, as they too were doing extremely well. It was the golden age of industry. True, it did not last. The Americans permitted the credit system to get out of

control and a disastrous slump ensued, but those times will return. In this country it is essential to improve conditions in our mines, but there must also be the incentive to increase production. It is not easy at this stage of the war, but it is essential that there be more consumer goods in the shops as soon as possible.

It is often asked why the miners should be so different as almost to form a separate class. The nature of the work is unlike anything else. Further, owing to the lack of transport in the past, the miners were largely isolated in their pit villages. They did not live in large towns like other workers. Among miners there is a great sense of tradition, though the advance of mechanisation has undoubtedly reduced the sense of pride, and indeed superiority, which characterised the old hand hewer. There is, too, a vast amount of custom among miners, and this varies from coalfield to coalfield. Miners are different from other workers, and indeed from each other, while from the national angle, they are different because coal is our main industry, and because it is the raw material of all others.

The public are led to believe that there is a bad feeling in the industry. That is a misrepresentation. In nearly every case the relations between management and men are of a most friendly nature. In many cases the pit production committees have done very useful work. They are, of course, a new conception, and mining being a highly conservative industry, they cannot be expected to prove 100 per cent. successful all at once. But it has proved a very valuable innovation and should prove even more valuable with the new development work ahead. Politicians are prone to draw pictures of a body of sullen workmen who do not give of their best because they resent their labours going to swell the profits of the absentee coal owner. This is much exaggerated, and the purchase of the royalties bears it out. Propagandists used to tell us that what the miner objected to most was that some 6d. on every ton of coal hewed by him went to the royalty owner, who contributed nothing. Now the royalty owner has been bought out by the State, and it is a matter of indifference to the miner whether the State or an individual receives it. The absentee colliery owner has a definite irritation value when times are bad, and his bad

example is valuable propaganda for Socialists at election time. There is no place for him in the new economy, and under a policy of amalgamation he must be got rid of, but it cannot truthfully be said that he weighs very heavily on the miner's mind.

Why then do the miners vote for nationalisation? Firstly, because their leaders tell them that it will be to their advantage. Secondly, because in the period between wars the miner had a raw deal; wages were low and unemployment was high. He is desperately afraid of a repetition of his unhappy lot, and is ready to try something else, thinking it could not be worse. Thirdly, he feels that the private owner will close his mine in a period of bad trade, whereas the State would have to keep the pits working, regardless of the loss.

This is not the time to argue nationalisation in detail. Let me take two extremes. Firstly, in the Soviet Union all the mines naturally are State owned. Production of coal must be efficient: if it had not been, the Russians would never have been able to resist the German onslaught, but does everyone imagine that the British miner would submit to conditions which would severely restrict his liberty? Furthermore, he does not seem to realise that under nationalisation the activities of his own Union would be drastically curtailed. At the other end of the scale stands U.S.A., a country which under private enterprise has reached the highest level of industrial efficiency the world has yet seen. They have no use for State ownership. True they have their disputes in the coal industry, but they are not concerned with the ownership of the mines. John L. Lewis knows just as well as the employees that if the State were to operate the mines it would be a disaster for all concerned. Lewis's job is to see that the men get their fair share of the proceeds of the industry, which is the true role of the Trade Union Leader. So long as the men get a square deal, Lewis cooperates with the employers to secure maximum efficiency of production. I was myself in U.S.A. at the time of the General Strike, and I can testify to the harsh criticism by employers and men concerning all sections of the British Coal Industry. Trade Union officials in U.S.A. openly expressed their contempt for the leaders of the Miners' Federation who were adopting a policy of the mines for

the miners which would only bankrupt their industry and lead to national impoverishment.

Whether or not to nationalise the mines is a question that can only be decided by the people ; but it is the uncertainty surrounding it which is causing so much trouble. The miners' leaders tell the men that their interests will never be properly looked after until the mines are State owned : the men believe this. The nation rejects nationalisation at a General Election. How then can we expect leaders and men to put their backs into the job when they believe their industry is run on wrong lines ? There is always the temptation to go slow or hinder production until the nation, in its exasperation, votes for an alternative policy. Again, what is the position of the employers ? The swing of the pendulum returns to power a Socialist Government pledged to nationalise the mines with or without compensation. What inducement is there for them to invest further money in an already hazardous industry which may be taken from them in the near future ? The Reid Report bears this out very clearly. A political uncertainty which does not exist in U.S.A. is hindering our coal industry at every turn. In order to maintain our standard of living we have got to increase our exports. Our principal competitors will be Americans. Does anyone really think that we stand a chance if we propose to challenge a nation of enterprising individualists with our main industry tied hand and foot by the bureaucracy of State ownership ?

The colliery owners have an indifferent record in the period between wars. The Reid Report aptly says : ' They have been prepared neither to accept the principle of the survival of the fittest, nor fully to abandon their traditional individualism.' They have not pressed forward with amalgamations, although the necessity is now abundantly clear, and although Parliament has urged them to mend their ways. As in the past they rarely made concessions unless forced to do so, so now they have refused to reorganise of their own volition until it is too late. Eventually they appointed Mr Robert Foot, a man of great administrative ability and of proved success in business, to reorganise the industry for them. He was a stranger to the production of coal, and therefore free from prejudice and past bitterness, but it was tantamount to

admitting that the colliery owners, whose whole lives were bound up in the industry, were unable to solve their problems. Mr Foot produced a scheme in record time. Had such a scheme been put forward some ten years ago it would have been hailed with enthusiasm for its statesmanlike qualities. Now it is too late ; the colliery owners have missed another 'bus.

The Foot Scheme has been humourously described as 'Government of the coal owners for the coal owners by the coal owners.' The Central Council, which is to effect the reorganisation, is to consist entirely of employers and the public will not tolerate this. These are the men who failed to organise the industry when they had chance after chance to do so. Why should they alone be trusted to do it now ? The basis of the Council must be broadened. Mr Foot insists that efficiency cannot be maintained if the Central Council is to include representatives of the men or the consumers, because the conflict of interests which must occur on occasions would lead to indecision and delay. I maintain that efficiency is not maintained now, precisely because the men are not represented at the top. Lt-Col Lancaster, M.P., an enlightened and progressive coal owner, together with Capt. Thorneycroft, M.P., gave the industry a fine lead in their scheme—'A Policy for Coal'—produced early in 1944. They recommend a *Joint* reorganisation committee of three commissioners, three representatives of the employers, and three of the men. Again, Sir Richard Redmayne advises a national *Joint* Mining Council. Only the colliery owners want to put the clock back. It will not do. The old system has been tried and found wanting. The new coal owners, the public, are determined to try something new.

On the other side of the ledger the public feels that the miner had a raw deal between the wars. They feel now that during the war the miner has obtained far more than he has ever asked before, but that in return he has reduced his output and frequently defied his leaders by indulging in illegal strikes. They know that all too many of the best men joined the forces and that the labour standard deteriorated. They strongly resent statements by Mr Lawther that the miners will never work properly until the mines are nationalised. This can only mean that the miners refused to pull their weight in a national emergency ;

as one who has served overseas with miners, I do not believe this. Or again, they resent Mr James Griffith's statement on the wireless that unless the mines are nationalised the grates will be empty this winter. The excitable Welshman will learn that political blackmail is particularly repugnant to a true democracy. The citizens in the main have come to the conclusion that if in pre-war days the owners were at fault, then the men have not distinguished themselves in this war, and that a better effort all round is required.

What is required to-day is a new spirit in the coal industry. The first requirement is the establishment of a joint statutory authority to direct a general national policy for coal, both inland and export. This body will effect a drastic programme of amalgamations which in addition to the obvious advantages will eliminate the absentee colliery owners and the guinea-pig director as in the reorganisation of the railways into four groups. It will be in a position to raise the necessary capital, but its decisions will be left to be carried out solely by the various managements working in consultation with the pit production committees. Such a joint body should bring home to the men the idea of joint ownership—that capital and labour are essential to each other. Further, there should be an attempt to introduce the principle of co-partnership. Let the joint body issue special stock or shares of a low denomination so that the thrifty miner may invest, and thus become more closely connected with the welfare of the concern. As the miner appreciates a mild gamble, I should not object to an issue of premium bonds bearing a low rate of interest, but offering the chance of a substantial cash bonus, but that is too controversial a measure. Schemes for training and education for new entrants into the industry should be taken in hand by the joint body and made universal throughout the country. The aim should be for every newcomer to feel that there are no class barriers, and that if he works hard, a career lies ahead of him. There used to be a saying that in every recruit's knapsack there could be found a Field Marshal's baton. Let this principle be applied in our coal mines.

There is no reason why a new joint authority should not be able in the course of time to inculcate into the production of coal that happy spirit of cordiality and coopera-

tion which characterises the miners' welfare. We have the mines, the men, and the mining engineers. We need more machinery and more goodwill to enable us to produce more coal at lower prices. Nationalisation would eliminate initiative and enterprise: the Foot plan does not embrace the miners in partnership. Let us therefore compromise by setting up a joint body on which employers, men, and consumer can pool their brains to devise a new policy for coal. Given the new spirit in a new deal for coal we can produce sufficient coal at an economic price and yet pay the miner a worthy wage.

CASTLEREAGH.

Art. 4.—THE CHRISTIAN CONTRIBUTION TO SOCIAL ORDER.

THE great clamour of disappointment set up by those numberless citizens who so badly wanted to read Professor G. M. Trevelyan's 'English Social History' and could not get hold of a copy may be a fact of some historical significance. Many of them wanted to read it not only because past experience had taught them that anything Professor Trevelyan wrote would hold them entranced to the very last page, but rather because their minds were at that moment projected forward into the mist which conceals from them the social shape of things to come in England. What so authoritative a survey had to say about the long past might well furnish a clue to the crucial future, and even if it did not, the reading of such a book could hardly fail to be one element in a wise preparation for living the socially good life in whatever the social shape and framework of post-war England may be. And if any reader could not say that he had found quite that in it (though it is there to find) at the least he will have been made freshly aware of how completely the past governs the future, and how tremendous is the price of misery exacted for any attempt to tear a generation out of its historic context by revolutionary action. This in itself is perhaps no bad preparation for living well in the next extremely demanding twenty years.

Those who believe that Christianity has something to bring to a social order without which it can neither be healthy nor fulfil its true purpose, but who are vague indeed as to just what this element is, will specially gain by letting Professor Trevelyan's majestic tale set their thoughts in motion as they set themselves to struggle towards a greater precision of statement. For this quest lies still mainly within the kingdoms of the mind, and 'English Social History' is the book which, more than most others, stimulates the mind and sets it racing. The reading of it prompts a great many questions, but one more insistently than all: In what period of our history did the highest proportion of our people live most happily, and find the fullest sense of satisfaction in being alive? We might well start there, as long as we think of it as a starting point and not as a goal. There is an old controversy set between the Utilitarians and the Idealists as to whether, as the Utilitarians held, the greatest happiness of the greatest number can be regarded as an adequate test of social health. The Idealists held that it could not, and all the best political economists uphold them. Christians certainly cannot be Utilitarians in this sense because they cannot equate happiness with Christian joy. Contrariwise, it is certainly true that the chronically unhappy cannot be joyful, so that, bearing this caution in mind, we may start with that question.

Professor Trevelyan suggests two periods, though he does not long hesitate over his own choice between them. The first is the Elizabethan era, and the second 1740 to 1780. Of the second he writes:

'In these years we find a generation of men wholly characteristic of the eighteenth century ethos, a society with a mental outlook of its own, self-poised, self-judged, and self-approved.'

Those three Selves ring ominously. No wonder this golden age lasted only forty years.

'The Gods mercifully gave mankind this little moment of peace between the religious fanaticisms of the past and the fanaticisms of class and race that were speedily to arise and dominate time to come. It was an age of creative vigour in all the trades and arts that serve and adorn the life of man.'

It is a most attractive picture, nicely calculated to cause the reader of 1945 to sigh with a sense of homesickness.

But the Professor's admiration of the Elizabethan age is stronger still :

'After the economic and religious unrest of the middle Tudor period followed the Golden Age of England. Golden ages are not all of gold, and they never last long. But Shakespeare chanced upon the best time and country in which to live, in order to exercise with least distraction and most encouragement the highest faculties of man. The Elizabethan English were in love with life, not with some theoretic shadow of life. Large classes freed as never before from poverty felt the uprising of the spirit, and expressed it in wit, music, and song.'

Even the seamy sides of Elizabethan society were less squalid than the corresponding blots upon the eighteenth century. The Boar's Head in Eastcheap was a better pub than anything in Gin Alley, Falstaff's band of ruffians of Gad's Hill wore an air which Macheath's gang utterly lacked, and the poverty of the unpaid sailors of the Armada was less degrading than what had presently to be endured in the purlieus of eighteenth-century Drury Lane. The Elizabethan age, in spite of all its blemishes, which were many, was socially golden because in the very air men breathed there was a zest for living, and a nearly universal fulfilment of the saying, 'Whatever thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might.' A higher proportion of the English people were happy then than ever before or since ; and from these examples we might begin to build up a definition of social health by saying that whatever else it must contain, there must be in it the spirit that life is worth while and to be lived with zest. Correspondingly, the definition of the specific Christian contribution to social health begins at the same point, and may be expressed by saying that the first duty of Christians to social order lies in the creation of the appropriate spirit. The definition does not end there. It may or may not lead us on to make particular principles about the economic framework of social order. But our first business is with a spirit, and unless we do firmly start there, everything else we say is likely to be wrong.

Nobody is likely to contradict Professor Trevelyan's choice of the Elizabethan age as the golden period in English social order. That being so, it becomes worth while to ask what were its leading features. We must

remember, of course, that it was the distinctive spirit in it which fertilised the economic arrangement of that society, and not vice versa ; but human nature changes very slowly, and the social scheme of things which provided the appropriate mould for that spirit is likely in principle to be not unsuitable for subsequent generations of Englishmen. All the best scholars of Elizabethan literature are converging in their judgment of what constituted the leading feature of the social scene which Shakespeare knew. It was the prized system of Hierarchy or Degree by which society was so arranged that every one had his natural superior whom he obeyed and his natural inferior whom he ruled. Over and over again the writers liken this system to an intricate, figured, but orderly dance. It was derived from antiquity, rooted in classicism, and lauded by all the best minds.

The system of Hierarchy and Degree was by no means just another name for feudalism. Elizabethan society was fast passing out of the feudal phase, but it was certainly hierarchical. Its sanctions went far deeper. Its exponents would say that it was implicit in the very structure of heaven, and the clue to the whole plot of 'Paradise Lost' was Lucifer's rebellion against it. Coming down from heaven it was part and parcel of all that is timelessly constant in human nature on earth. The best modern description of it is in Mr C. S. Lewis's 'Preface to Paradise Lost,' who, drawing on Milton, thus describes it :

'Degrees of value are objectively present in the universe. Everything except God has some natural superior ; everything except unformed matter has some natural inferior. The goodness, happiness, and dignity of every being consists in obeying its natural superior and ruling its natural inferior. When it fails in either part of this twofold task we have disease or monstrosity in the scheme of things until the peccant being is either destroyed or corrected. One or the other it certainly will be ; for by stepping out of its place in the system (whether it steps up like a rebellious angel or down like an uxorious husband) it has made the very nature of things its enemy. It cannot succeed.'

The Elizabethan world took all this so much for granted that its thinkers did not often stay to defend it, but there is a superb passage in Shakespeare's 'Troilus and Cressida'

in which he lauds the hierarchical system as the sole prop of ordered society. He puts it in the mouth of Ulysses, when he was explaining to the Greek princes why the siege of Troy had halted on lame feet for seven years. It was precisely because the feuds of the chieftains had denied the Greek host the morale which observance of Hierarchy and Degree would bring them.

'The Heavens themselves, the planets, and this centre
Observe degree, priority, and place,
Insisture, course, proportion, season, form,
Office, and custom, in all line of order. . . .

But when the planets
In evil mixture to disorder wander,
What plagues and what portents, what mutiny,
What raging of the sea, shaking of the earth,
Commotion in the winds, frights, changes, horrors
Divert and crack, rend and deracinate
The unity and married calm of states
Quite from their fixture. Oh, when degree is shak'd,
Which is the ladder to all high designs,
The enterprise is sick . . .
Take but degree away, untune that string,
And hark! What discord follows. Each thing
Meets in mere oppugnancy. The bounded waters
Should life their bosoms higher than the shores
And make a sop of all this solid globe.'

So judged the greatest mind of all humanity, and in fact there have been far more Christians who would echo than would deny what Shakespeare said. The danger of a society so conceived around the pattern of a figured dance is the opportunity which it gives to tyranny, but the specifically Christian social tradition, coming down from the Middle Ages, tempered it by the unanimous declaration of its thinkers that tyranny is to be righteously resisted, and that, given tyranny, a failure to resist it is to share in its sin. Even Milton, who believed this social doctrine as strongly as Shakespeare, had to find room in his scheme for the Regicides and for resistance to Charles II. The Elizabethans themselves had tempered its rigidity. Professor Trevelyan emphasises that although Elizabethan social order was hierarchical it was also fluid, and the divisions between grades and classes were not unscaleable barriers. Society was no longer completely feudal, and

large numbers of nouveaux riches—Cecils, Walsinghams, and the Tudor dynasty itself—had stormed the gates of the highest society and been made free of it.

Elizabethan society was the happiest society England has ever known, and it was fundamentally hierarchical. Evidently the social requirement that the living of the good life involves the acceptance of the duty to rule and to be ruled does fit human nature and does no outrage to the dignity of personality. The system of Hierarchy and Degree is perfectly compatible with that freedom which, for Christianity, is at once both end and means.

From all this two further principles of a Christian social order can be drawn. First, as we have seen, the spirit of zest must be in it. Then, the whole social framework must be orderly: it must be constructed to an identifiable pattern, and this pattern must be secure. Thirdly, within this pattern, this game of chess, there must be a free fluidity so that the players can all move easily from one position in the hierarchy to another according to their capabilities.

Now we can turn to the New Testament, which is after all of a still higher authority than either Shakespeare or Milton. Taking it as a whole there is plainly nothing in it which says one word to disallow any of the three principles which we have drawn from our consideration of the Elizabethan age. The first two, indeed, are positively endorsed. The third is taken for granted since without fluidity of movement within the social scheme there can be no individual freedom. But the New Testament adds two vital principles to these. First, it says something about what social order should always and everywhere be; and second, it describes the kind of change which the gradual acceptance of the Christian discipleship brings about even in the best, that is, in the most approximately Christian social order.

St Paul's view of Christian society is that it must be organic, and that only so can it reflect the spirit of Christ. Over and over again he returns to one or another of his variations of 'he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers.' The point is not so much that nobody has a monopoly of the talents, but that every talent has to be used, and, more, that every living soul has a distinctive

talent and no society can be Christian if its framework fails to protect and to foster the development of every talent. Each is different, but they find their unity in Christ, for Christian living in society is life 'in Christ.' Christ's own parable of the Talents leaps to the mind as endorsing all this insight. The organic view of Christian society is not only compatible with an hierarchical framework, but St Paul carries this to lengths which Shakespeare would probably consider immoral for there are also masters and slaves, and the new Christian relationship between Philemon and Onesimus does not cancel the old economic relationship. There is in fact but little, if there is any allowance made in St Paul's social theory for the principle of fluidity of movement within the hierarchical framework of Christian society. The second New Testament principle is that where life is lived 'in Christ' the barriers of society gradually crumble away. The strength of unity is such that the separations are unimportant. Bond or free, Greek or Jew, man or woman—the distinctions remain but the separation goes. Hierarchy may remain but there is nothing in it to separate. This is a process which can start happening anywhere and at any time wherever obedience to and the inspiration of God have free course. St Paul had seen it happen again and again in this and that local church. But the inference is that the power by which the barriers come down is not secular revolutionary action—which invariably erects barriers still thicker and taller—but fellowship in Christ, which in healthy society is treated as an end in itself, a good in its own right. They crumble; they are not brought down with a great crash.

So far we have found three great principles of social order. Two of them did not come from specifically Christian sources but the Bible endorses them both. The third was drawn direct from the Bible but the social experience of the Elizabethan age, which was not at all remarkable for religious devotion, endorses it. These three were, first, the spirit of zest for life; second, the obligation of individual responsibility in a stable society, expressed for the Elizabethans in the system of Hierarchy and Degree; and third, the need for fluidity of movement as between different grades in society. But to these a fourth must be added, without which the first three will be

always pulling in opposite directions. It synthesises them, and therefore it derives from them and is their keystone. This fourth social principle is the absolute need of variety within uniformity. A social uniformity, however outwardly democratic and even Christian, which allows no variety within itself, which even fails actively to encourage variety will always be chronically fissiparous and therefore destructive of the initial uniformity. Particularly must this be true of all societies in an advanced stage of mechanistic civilisation, for every machine loathes every kind of variation from the normal. In fact (and to put it more picturesquely) the freak is not the least among the guardians of our liberties.

Now, if it is agreed that this variety within uniformity is an absolute need of a stable social order which is human, how much more is it the first condition of a social order which is Christian? Our own existing social order therefore is most in danger of becoming less than Christian precisely because of the means it **MUST** take in the conditions of the post-war world (so far as these can yet be known) to ensure the mere survival of the basic elements of civilisation, let alone to banish want and to promote social security. The omniscient state has come to stay: it is the conditional of survival. A planned society is not an idle dream. It is an actual achievement of the war and a certain prospect of the peace. But when an omniscient state sets itself to produce a planned society its temptation is to ride roughshod over every variation from the statistically normal. It attacks the human craving for variety first in the sphere of luxuries, then in the sphere of real needs, such as food, clothes, and houses, and finally it will attack the idea of variety in the sphere of character. Every piece of large-scale planning must by the compulsions of its own nature postulate a reduction in the administratively tiresome variety of human needs, fancies, and idiosyncracies. Yet it is to a society composed of ever increasing concentrations of economic and political power, and presided over by an omniscient state, that the Christian social principles, with their insistence upon fluidity, variety, and freedom, have to be applied. The test of the extent to which the omniscient state and all it stands for can be regarded as an instrument of the fundamental Christian social

purpose is the freedom of corporations, fellowships societies, and churches within the state to be different from the normal in their cultural climates, and to assert those differences in the teeth of the majority. The chief danger is from the torrents of triviality, vulgarity, and cheapness of values with which the press and the cinema daily deluge us.

That may give us the beginnings of an answer to the most difficult question which the triumph of the omniscient state is presently going to set to Christian statesmanship. At what point in its march must the Church oppose it in the interests of Christian social order? The answer seems to be, when the state begins to show signs of riding roughshod, and solely in the interests of economical administrative efficiency, over the separate freedoms of self expression of corporations, societies, and communities within itself. A social order working towards genuinely Christian ends will never be as neat and tidy as the Civil Service mind would like. Only a small part of the method of this opposition will be protest and denunciation. The greater part must always be by opposing bad suggestion by good, since it is by suggestion far more than by exhortation that 'peoples' habits are formed; and habits are twenty times more influential than conscious plans. Only a minority will espouse a plan, but every human being must get his living each day.

But the immediately urgent business of Christians is with the engendering and the fostering of that spirit of zest for living which is part and parcel of the Gospel. In proportion as we are able to analyse it we shall know roughly how we ought to be promoting it. The spirit of a Christian zest for life seems to have three component parts. The basic foundation of it is fellowship. Here Christianity pure and simple and the social order in the world which it seeks to establish touch hands, for the Christian life is a life of fellowship, and any social order worth the name erects itself upon fellowship. Fellowship is thus an absolute, something purely good in and for itself, quite as apart from anything that is done with it. If all goes well, it grows into community, and community is the one and the only technical term which the Christian and the secular world both constantly use, as meaning something which both value and both understand. But

in so far as this idea of the creative value of fellowship is inspired by the Christian spirit and is intended to serve Christian ends, it will always tend towards egalitarianism. This it will do both because fellowship is real only as between equals, and without this sense of equality no fellowship can develop into a community, and also because Christian fellowship must reproduce in social form the essential fact that all are equally the children of God, and each one of unique and imperishable significance to Him. Thus of all forms of government and social order democracy stands nearest to the Christian doctrine of man ; and a democracy conceived of as the right climate for the growth of fellowship will be a sufficient check upon the need of any social order to build itself to a definite pattern of hierarchy. Finally, the Christian spirit of social zest for living will always value diversity, holding this variety of taste and idiosyncrasy of character to be the actual conditions of any orderly social development in the direction of working out the implications of God's love for society. Social uniformity always tends towards dullness and variety towards colour, and no country or social order which the Christian faith has taken hold of is ever drab. It is here that the next Christian battle will certainly have to be fought.

ROGER LLOYD.

Art. 5.—BURMA.

1. *They shall not Sleep.* By Leland Stowe. A. A. Knopf, New York, 1944.
2. *Peoples of South-East Asia.* By Bruno Lasker. Gollancz, 1944.
3. *The Future of South-East Asia.* By K. M. Panikkar. Allen and Unwin, 1944.
4. *Burma.* By Ma Mya Sein. Oxford University Press, 1944.
5. Burma Pamphlets :—
 1. *Burma Background.* By B. R. Pearn.
 2. *Burma Setting.* By O. H. K. Spate.
 3. *Buddhism in Burma.* By G. Appleton.

4. *The Forests of Burma.* By F. T. Morehead.
5. *The Hill Peoples of Burma.* By H. N. C. Stevenson. Longmans, Green & Co., 1945.
6. *Wingate's Raiders.* By C. J. Rolo. G. G. Harrap, 1944.
7. *With Wingate in Burma.* By David Halley. Hodge & Co., 1944.
8. *Beyond the Chindwin.* By Bernard Fergusson. Collins, 1945.
9. *Blue Print for Burma.* National Union of Conservative and Unionist Associations, 1944.
10. *Burma Statement of Policy.* By H.M.G. Command, 6635. H.M.S.O., 1945.
11. *The Tropical Far East.* By J. S. Furnivall. Oxford University Press (Oxford Pamphlet No. 71), 1945.

A YEAR ago few people would have ventured to predict that in little over six months our troops would have entered Rangoon. At that time we had driven the Japanese back from the Indian frontier and had foiled their attempt to cut our communications in Assam, and converted their boasted invasion of India into a costly failure. But all we held of Burma was a small area in the extreme north with Myitkyina and Mogaung on the railway and part of the Chin Hills in the north-west. Six or seven hundred miles, most of it through difficult country with very inadequate communications, still lay ahead of us and our forward bases were connected with India only by the new military roads driven through the mountains which divide Assam from Burma, or by air.

The Story of the Burma Campaign, when it is eventually written, will tell of success in overcoming natural obstacles which perhaps surpassed in difficulty any met with in the whole history of war. Mechanical inventions such as the bull-dozer which enabled the new roads to be constructed played a great part as did medical science which with the aid of the new drug mepacrine evolved a method, if not of curing or preventing, at any rate of keeping under control the ravages of malaria, which in the earlier stages of the campaign was the worst enemy our forces had to face. The air force was used to bring in supplies, equipment, and reinforcements, and to evacuate casualties, on an unprecedented scale,

and air-communication alone made possible the Wingate expeditions, which have struck the imagination of the world more than any event of the Campaign, perhaps even of the whole war. Wingate was a genius, of the type which this country produces on occasion, the type of Cromwell, of Wolfe, and of Gordon, unconventional, exacting, but possessing that power of leadership which made his men follow him on the most desperate ventures, and combining the widest imaginative scope with the closest attention to every detail of organisation. The three books on his expeditions tell little more than the story of the particular parties to which their authors were attached, and the whole story will probably never be satisfactorily told, for in the nature of things the expeditions had to split up into small parties, the adventures of each of which were an epic. Colonel Fergusson's 'Beyond the Chindwin' is the best of the three, indeed one of the best books produced about any campaign in this war, and has been deservedly praised, not only as a story of a gallant adventure but also on its literary merits. How much the Wingate expeditions affected the ultimate success of the campaign will no doubt be keenly discussed, but they proved the possibility of air-borne and air-supplied operations behind the enemy's lines on a scale never before attempted.

Apart from these three the rest of the books about Burma have been either background material or discussions of the future of the country and of South-East Asia in general. The former were badly needed, for there is lamentably little up-to-date material about a country as large and important as Burma. Of the pamphlets that by Ma Mya Sein, daughter of a distinguished Burmese public servant who has made a reputation by her writings and broadcasts, gives an admirable summary from the point of view of a Burmese nationalist who is loyal to the British connection. The series of Longman's pamphlets, published in India, and now on sale in this country, are both useful and readable. One of the most attractive is that on the Hill Tribes written by an officer with long experience and great sympathy for those interesting people, whose bitter opposition to the Japanese had much influence on the early stages of our invasion from the north.

It is the future of Burma which is of most interest

now that the Japanese have been driven out, but plans for the future must be based on knowledge of the past, of the history and character of the people of Burma, of the system of British administration, and last but by no means least, of the events of the Japanese occupation. The last three stormy years must have opened the eyes of the Burmans to a number of stark facts which even the political leaders had only faintly grasped and the mass of the people had never even imagined. It would be folly to think that we are returning to the Burma of 1941, and that all that need be done is to replace the old system that was then in force. Like all human systems it had its merits and its defects, though some critics can only see the defects. Mr Leland Stowe's book deals mainly with China, where he bitterly criticises the Chungking regime; in the part which deals with Burma, he is equally critical of British administrative methods. His views are not shared by all American critics, for Mr Bruno Lasker accords high praise to the system and to the men who carried it out. If Mr Stowe's criticisms were all justified it would be difficult to explain the reception which has been accorded to our forces and to the Civil Officers who accompanied them, not only by the hill-tribes of the north but by the more sophisticated Burmese of the plains. The most remarkable feature of the Japanese occupation has been their complete failure to gain any lasting support from the mass of the people of Burma. The Burma National Army, which the Japanese radio boasted to the world was fighting side by side with them to keep out the hated European, was never met in the field, and eventually came over to our side. Of the Puppet Government under Dr Ba Maw which has been ruling the country under close Japanese supervision, some, including the leader, have retreated with the Japanese forces, but a number have remained and have already met the Governor, Sir Reginald Dorman-Smith, and discussed future prospects with him at Rangoon. Of those who fled with the Japanese it is permissible to wonder how many did so out of real conviction, and how many under duress or from the feeling that they had committed themselves so completely that no other course was possible. If reports are correct even Dr Ba Maw himself was becoming restive under the Japanese domination.

The Japanese played their cards extremely badly, and failed almost inexplicably to make good use of their two main assets, that they were fellow Asiatics, and that they were, or at least claimed to be, fellow Buddhists. Anybody with the most elementary knowledge of Burmese psychology could have told them that the biggest mistake they could make was to disregard the religious sentiment of the people, but they appear to have done so. Forced labour they were no doubt compelled to exact, but in view of the intense dislike of the system by the Burmese they might have been expected to do it less clumsily. Public face-slapping, which seems to be one of their favourite ways of enforcing orders, is the surest method that could be devised to offend a people of such marked racial pride as the Burmese. But what seems to have disillusioned the Burmese more than anything was that the invaders, who had always posed as Buddhists, did not even trouble to pay common respect to the religious buildings, pagodas, and monasteries, which are such a feature of the country.

All this has saved us a good deal of trouble, but the fact that the Japanese made themselves highly unpopular does not necessarily mean that they have made us highly popular as rulers of the country. It is no exaggeration to say that every Burman is a nationalist. The so-called independence which the Japanese bestowed on Burma was soon discovered to be a mockery, and the word was the subject of puns of the kind that appeal to the Burmese sense of humour, but it is not likely to have killed their desire for full self-government and may even have increased it. The crux of the political problem is how to combine self-government with security in a country of the size of Burma, situated as it is between India and China, the two largest countries in the world, and now at last connected with both by modern highways.

A year ago a group of Conservative members of Parliament published their 'Blue Print for Burma,' and strongly urged the necessity for a clear declaration by His Majesty's Government of their intentions; in June of this year a White Paper on the subject appeared. Like so many White Papers it has been criticised for its manner of presentation more than for its actual contents. The clear promise of Dominion Status at the earliest possible

date and the undertaking that the new Constitution of Burma should be framed by the Burmans themselves, were less clearly emphasised than the difficulties of the present situation and the impossibility of returning even to the constitution of 1937 for a considerable period, which it was estimated might last as long as three years. The subsequent debate in the House of Commons, and the announcement made to a Burman delegation of all parties by the Governor, should have done much to remove any unfavourable first impressions, but even so it cannot be expected that the plan will altogether satisfy Burman nationalist aspirations. Whatever the practical objections may be to fixing a date for the grant of Dominion Status, the psychological effect on the Burmese temperament might have outweighed them, and disarmed criticism on other points. Of these, two are outstanding, the period of three years for which direct rule may legally continue, and the exclusion from the scheme of the Shan States and the tribal areas round the frontiers. It has been so clearly explained by the Governor that three years is to be regarded as a maximum period which it is hoped to shorten in practice, and that at the first possible moment an Executive Council of Burmans, drawn from the various communities and parties, and a small Legislative Council are to be appointed until regular elections can be held, that it may be hoped that criticism on this score will not be serious. The second point is more difficult: Burma has clearly marked geographical frontiers nearly everywhere, and its present limits vary little from those of the Pagan Kingdom nine hundred years ago, while the internal boundaries between the plains and the hill-tracts are not as a rule clearly marked. The whole country is a natural economic unit; with the possible exception of the most easterly Shan States across the Salween, the easiest communications from the frontiers are into Burma proper, and those towards the surrounding countries, India, China, and Siam are exceedingly difficult. Ethnically the Kachins and Chins are closely related to the Burmese. The Shans it is true are a branch of the widely spread Thai people, to whom the Siamese belong, but they have never been ruled from Bangkok, and both ancient tradition and modern economic ties connect them with Burma.

At the same time there is no disguising the fact that
Vol. 283.—No. 566. 2 G

they do not welcome the idea of domination by an indigenous Government which would be preponderantly Burmese, for the Burmese greatly outnumber all the other peoples of the country. Also the Burmese have developed their own way of life to such an extent that they have a marked dislike for living among other people with different customs, and they would find it far from easy to administer either the semi-independent Shan States, whose hereditary rulers were never under any but the loosest control of the Burmese Court, or, even more, tribal communities of the rugged independence of the Kachins and Chins, who are Animists and quite unfit yet for the elaborate methods of modern democracy.

The minority communities in Burma cannot look back on the records of the Burmese Government with great satisfaction, and this problem will be one of the most difficult in the future. It is closely connected with the problem of defence, for the Burman army has been recruited mainly from the hill-tribes who have shown themselves more amenable to discipline than the Burmese. It is to be hoped that recent events will have shown the Burmese the vital importance, in their own interest as well as in that of the other communities, of evolving a system of administration which will satisfy the latter and will permit the whole country to be placed under a single government. The scheme now proposed under which the hill-tracts and the Shan States are to remain for the present under the direct administration of the Governor, though the most equitable temporary solution, is likely to be fraught with considerable difficulties.

Politically Burma is now assured of complete self-government after the lapse of a few years, but her economic and social problems, which are not dealt with in the White Paper, will tax all her energies. The immediate problems are much the same as in the liberated countries of Europe ; the restoration of the transport system and the distribution of consumer goods, the problem of inflation caused by the Japanese flooding the country with worthless paper money, the restoration of law and order and the rounding up of the gangs of robbers who infest the countryside are among the most urgent. The reconstruction of agriculture, forestry, and industry will take longer and is largely dependent on shipping which even now that the Japanese

war is finished will be a serious difficulty. The paddy-fields and the forests remain; cultivation of rice and extraction of timber should soon be restored to something like its former level, but the prosperity of the country depends on shipping for the export of its products, of which rice, amounting to over three million tons a year, is by far the most important. Of the saw-mills which converted the timber some are reported to be not seriously damaged, but the oilfields and refineries were thoroughly sabotaged to deny their use to the enemy and it will take some years to restore them.

Agriculture is in the hands of the people of the country, but industry, transport, and ocean-shipping has been controlled by British firms and financed by British capital. This predominance of British commercial interests has been made the source of complaints of Burma's 'exploitation,' and may, now that political autonomy is assured, count for even more in the future. The cost of rehabilitating the country will be heavy, and the bulk of it will have to be met by the British Government, for the defence of Burma was an Imperial responsibility which they failed to discharge. However much liability they may agree to assume for the replacement of industrial plant deliberately sabotaged under military orders, the companies concerned will also be put to heavy expense, and they are better able to get work restarted in a reasonable time than any other agency. There may be demands from enthusiasts for the nationalisation of industry, but Burma could not produce for a long time to come either the technical experts or the capital required.

The responsibility for the fact that the economy of the country is dominated by non-Burman capital and personnel must be shared by the British Government and the Burmese. The latter have shown little inclination to adopt a business career and have been content to let British, Indians, and Chinese acquire their dominating position; but our Educational system, modelled on that of India, led too easily through Arts courses to Government service and the legal profession, and offered few avenues either to industry or to the technical professions such as engineering and medicine. A complete overhaul of the higher Educational system to meet the needs of the country for industrial and technical experts is required.

Another major problem which will have to be faced is that of the agrarian debt, due mainly to the Indian Chettyars, and of the land-tenure system. From a country of small owner-cultivators Burma, or at least Lower Burma where five-sixths of the rice-land is situated, has become a country of absentee landlords, most of whom are Indian, and of tenant farmers, nearly all of whom are heavily in debt, with an increasing number of landless labourers, who find themselves faced with severe competition from Indians whose standard of living is lower and whose capacity for work is generally higher.

How many of the Indians still remain in Burma is not yet known for certain, but it appears that a number of the agents of the Chettyar firms are still there, and though they are unlikely to have collected much of their debts during the lean years of the Japanese occupation, their claims will have to be settled. This is likely to lead to a fine crop of litigation. Some of them may have got their title-deeds and mortgage deeds over to India, others may have lost them and will have difficulty in proving their claims. One thing is certain, that the Burmans will be strongly opposed to accepting any return of the old system, and will demand an early settlement of these debts at the lowest rates which can be considered equitable, and the institution of some State system of agricultural finance to prevent the alienation of land and rack-renting in the future. A start in this direction had indeed been made before the invasion, and the 'Blue Print for Burma' rightly puts the solution of this problem in the forefront of its proposals.

Burma has always been a welter of small parties, each united more by loyalty to a personal leader than by any clear political principles. Among these parties was one known as the Thakins, a new party of young men with extreme nationalistic views. It was this party from which the active adherents of the Japanese were drawn at the time of the invasion, and they made an attempt to run the administration which the Japanese rapidly suppressed. The Burma National Army, mainly officered by members of this party, came over to us at the time of liberation, and the leaders of the party, which has now become the Anti-Fascist organisation, were among the deputation which met the Governor on his recent visit to

Rangoon. How much following they have in the country generally is not clear ; their methods in some cases seem to have been too arbitrary to endear them to the villagers, but they have formed an organisation too strong to be disregarded. There is little doubt that they soon became disillusioned about the Japanese, and were genuine enough in their desire to drive them out, but they are ardent Nationalists and may well clamour for nothing less than the complete independence of Burma. Also whatever their present attitude they did at first actively collaborate with the Japanese and there is likely to be considerable friction between them and those Burmans who remained loyal to the British connection, or at least refused to collaborate. Recent events in many European countries are an indication of what occurs after a period of enemy occupation, and there are bound to be struggles between rival parties and charges and counter-charges in which it will be far from easy to arrive at the truth.

One serious problem which may well cause trouble is the position of the Buddhist monastic order. The monks, of whom there are many thousands, are a great power in the country. The best of them are a power for good, but lack of organisation has made it possible for anybody to don the yellow robe and be accepted as a monk, and their ranks have been swollen by a number of undesirables, of whom some may have no worse motive than preference for a life of ease at the cost of their neighbours to a life of honest toil, but others are criminals evading the law. Under their vows they should take no interest in worldly affairs, but for the last generation they have taken a keen interest in politics, and many political leaders have found it useful to enlist their support, though the strict elders among the laity regard this development with disapproval. The Japanese are reported to have turned numbers of them out of the monasteries and generally treated them with scant respect. What the effect of this will be remains to be seen, but the hard times produced by the war may make even the devout Burman Buddhist consider the economic aspect of the virtue of supporting this large community of mendicants. The problem while primarily religious, has political, social, and economic aspects; and is one which a foreign non-Buddhist government could never deal with. Attempts made in recent years to

institute a higher standard of discipline in the order did not succeed, but if nothing is done the influence of the Buddhist faith, which Burma has preserved in a form nearer to its original beauty than any other country, may suffer, and the results of this would be deplorable.

All these problems are enough to tax to the utmost the abilities of the leaders of any country, and Burma, however much enthusiasm may be forthcoming, and there will be no lack of that, cannot claim long experience of either politics or economics, particularly of foreign affairs or of overseas trade and commerce. One unfortunate result of the position of Burma as a province of India until 1937 was that the Government of Burma had no concern with foreign affairs, finance or commerce, which were all central subjects dealt with by the Government of India. Critics have blamed the British for keeping Burmans ignorant of these important aspects of government, but the plain fact remains that the British Government officials in Burma had themselves very little knowledge of them, and with the exception of an occasional officer who served in the Government of India Secretariat, little opportunity of acquiring any more knowledge. At the time of separation therefore Burma was in a difficult position, for her political leaders had no permanent staff of real experience to whom they could turn for opinion on these matters. Foreign affairs were in the hands of the Governor, and were outside the control of the Legislature; the fact that the economic system of Burma was dominated by the non-Burman communities of British, Indians, and Chinese, made it impossible to draw a clear dividing line between foreign affairs and economics, and this naturally intensified the innate Burman dislike of foreigners, and warped their outlook on foreign affairs.

As for finance, there was a new post of Financial Adviser, but he was Adviser to the Governor, not to the Government, and had not got a seat in the Legislature, so that he was unable to take part in debates and to reply direct to some of the rather unorthodox views which were from time to time expressed by back-benchers. There was no official with any really wide experience of commerce; the European Group in the Legislature included some of the most experienced men of business, but their opinions were apt to be distrusted by many of the mem-

bers, who regarded them as the exploiters of the country. The length to which such distrust could go was shown by a public speech of the Minister for Commerce (later a prominent supporter of the Japanese) in which he declared that he would not mind if the export trade in rice ceased altogether, as the only people who made any profit out of it were the non-Burman exporters. The price paid to the Burman farmers for the three million tons of rice annually exported was, even in the worst years of the depression, something like 10,000,000L., and was by far the largest factor in the prosperity of Burma. Fortunately the Ministers were not as a rule so narrow-minded as this, but the fact that such a view could be expressed by a responsible leader is somewhat alarming. The fate of the country would be tragic if its affairs were to be conducted by politicians of this stamp without any guidance.

The danger of complete independence for small countries has been clearly shown by the events of the last few years, even in those parts of the world where foreign affairs and the hard facts of economics have been perforce much more familiar to the inhabitants than they have even been in a country with the background of Burma. The only country of South-East Asia which has retained its independence is Siam, and this is largely due to a very astute monarch in the nineteenth century who realised that to achieve this end it was necessary to abandon the isolation which the Burman kings continued to favour. He sent as many as possible of the younger members of his family and the ruling classes to be educated in Europe, and welcomed European Advisers and officials, a practice which still, though to a smaller extent, continued until the Japanese invasion in 1941.

Apart from inexperience, her geographical position makes complete independence a very dangerous ambition for Burma, lying as she does between India on the one side and China on the other, the two most populous and most impoverished countries in the world, with populations millions of whom are ready to emigrate to any part of the world where they can improve their standard of living. Whether the new roads from them into Burma which have been built for military purposes will attract emigrants is perhaps doubtful, for the easiest approaches to Burma are still by sea, but the war has made Burma much better

known and as an independent state she would be powerless to resist pressure from either of her two mighty neighbours.

In favour of independence there are certain to be arguments based on the Philippines, and a section of American opinion will uphold their policy as a contrast to the imperialism of Britain. In spite of certain points of resemblance, however, it must not be forgotten that the background is very different, including as it does in the Philippines three centuries of European influence, and the fact that Christianity is the main religion of the people. Of interest in this connection is a recent article in the American magazine 'Fortune' which says, 'Some Filipino leaders shrink before the prospect of immediate independence. . . . They say that the old arguments for independence are no longer valid. . . . They are prepared to admit that national independence is not synonymous with individual liberty.'

A federation of South-East Asia which has been discussed is an interesting but rather a visionary idea. Mr Furnivall's Oxford pamphlet leaves the impression that the underlying ethnical and cultural similarity hardly compensates for the wide differences which lack of intercourse between the various countries has brought about in the course of the centuries. Of Indo-China, of Malaya, of the Netherlands East Indies, the Burman knows next to nothing, and at no time in his history has he had any intercourse with these countries. Of Siam he knows at the present time little more, and all that his history tells him is of wars, of invasions as spectacular as the English invasions of France in the Middle Ages, and as completely unproductive of any permanent benefit. It is extremely difficult to see how any such federation is to be brought about, and how contact is to be established between the different countries spread over such an enormous area.

Mr Panikkar's book is an able and interesting study of the problem, but he looks forward frankly to a federation in which India would be the dominant partner, a solution which would make little appeal to any class of Burman. Chinese domination would be hardly less unpopular, and whether China has any ambitions in that direction remains to be seen. She will probably have enough to do to restore her own country, but the industrial expansion

of the South-western provinces which has taken place during the war is likely to be permanent, and to lead to a demand for the completion of the Burma-Yunnan railway and the use of Rangoon as a port for China, a development which in the long run should add to the prosperity of Burma, but the immediate consequences of which are certain to be strongly opposed by a large section of the Burmese.

There is finally the solution of remaining within the British Commonwealth of Nations, a solution which several of the most experienced Burmans have already recommended as the most likely to secure that combination of external security, internal prosperity, and freedom to develop along its own lines, which is the ambition of every country. This is what the White Paper contemplates, and Burma may become a test case to prove whether the British Commonwealth can be extended to embrace peoples of a completely different origin and mode of life to the communities of European origin who have up to date achieved full membership. It is one of the most interesting prospects of the future, and its success will need the utmost goodwill on both sides. The disasters of the first year of the Japanese war have changed fundamentally and permanently the relations between European and Asiatic peoples, and after the surrender of Singapore we can never expect to regain that prestige, already much diminished, which was so conspicuous an element in our position in the East. There is still much that we can do in the East, but the task will need to be approached in a different way. Advisers who are real experts in their own subjects, rather than Civil servants trained for direct administration, are likely to be needed, and if they can inculcate sound principles they will have to be content to see them put into practice by methods which may be very different from those they would themselves adopt. Individually, relations between Burmans and British have always been as good as those between any Europeans and Asiatics. It was the rigid formalism of our system which they disliked, particularly its importation of Indian methods, some of which were far from suitable to their new environment. Some method is required of adapting to the Burmese character the fundamental virtues of Western democracy, and the best features of the high

standard of material prosperity which Europe and America have attained, but the end cannot be achieved by forcing the Burman into a Procrustean bed entirely unsuited to his stature.

F. BURTON LEACH.

Art. 6.—A NEGLECTED PROPHET.

1. *Janus in Modern Life*. By W. M. Flinders Petrie. Constable, 1907.
2. *The Revolutions of Civilisation*. By W. M. Flinders Petrie. Harper, 1912.
3. *Some Sources of Human History*. By W. M. Flinders Petrie. S.P.C.K., 1919.

WHEN Mr Bernard Shaw visited the United States of America, in 1933, out of the very numerous invitations to lecture he accepted only one, that of the American Academy of Political Science. Anyone who knows Mr Shaw at all justly knows that for such an occasion he would try to say the most important thing he had to say, and he said this :

‘ Within my lifetime, our knowledge of history has been greatly extended. Thanks largely to the researches of Professor Flinders Petrie, we know of five or six civilisations which . . . progressed in the same way to the same artistic climaxes, the same capitalistic climaxes, the same democratic and feminist climaxes as we ; and they all perished. They reached a certain point and then collapsed because they had no internal stability. When they grew into huge populations crowded into big cities, the internal strain shattered them, the civilisation sank back into primitive life for the survivors. . . . What we are up against now is the fact that we too have reached the edge of the precipice over which these civilisations fell and were dashed to pieces. There is no mistaking the situation : the symptoms are the same ; the difficulties are the same ; and the possibilities of destruction are much greater.’

The history of civilisation is a series of plateaux—rapid rise, a slightly inclined plane, rapid fall.

The foundation of civilisation, both historically and in the present, is agriculture, because that discovery made possible the production of food enough to provide leisure wherein to bring forth civilisation and to have settled life. Agriculture, although it produced leisure, has from the first been arduous. It developed in the river valley where were afforded warmth, water, and alluvial soil. What must pretty certainly have happened, and what there is evidence for, was that the surplus produced by agriculture inaugurated a Golden Age. The Fall was brought about by increase in population, and prosperity having the effect of weakening the morale.

Adjacent to the civilisation are hardier people who descend upon the effete. They act as a stimulus to the latter, with the result that the indigenous population, by application, recovers its strength and assimilates the conquering people. Thus in ancient Egypt, for example, there was a sequence of civilisations.

History shows unmistakably that the most vigorous civilisations have not appeared in the environments apparently most favourable—although it turns out that they were favourable for drawing out character. Palestine, which produced two world religions, is about the size of Wales, hilly, with an untoward river, and was surrounded by the great military powers of antiquity, repeatedly invaded, fought over, and oppressed. Greece was also physically inhospitable and subject to wars. The civilisation of Rome was promoted by a handful of people who responded to the challenge of a difficult environment. Similar good records are supplied in modern times by Holland, Switzerland, Scotland, and England. The history of civilisations shows that, if sufficient citizens have accumulated, by inheritance and in turn by what they practise, certain habits of good quality in the right proportion, they can go from strength to strength. But if sufficient citizens fail sufficiently in these matters, then, no matter how long the visible fall is postponed, the civilisation falls. In our own country, when great adversity, such as war, inflicts a sufficiently powerful stimulus, our people stand up to it nobly: it is the ease of peace that is the most searching test.

Sir Flinders Petrie, in 'The Revolutions of Civilisation,' drew attention to the life-history of a civilisation.

The first necessity is law and order and this is established by a military conqueror. He rewards his generals by making them nobles. In course of time they establish power against the monarchy. Then comes aristocracy. Thereafter arises the middle class. According to Petrie, there is a sequence of phases reaching their apogees in turn—sculpture, painting, literature, music, mechanics, science, wealth.

‘Then gradually the transformation to democracy takes place. . . . Wealth continues to increase. When democracy has attained full power, the majority without capital necessarily eat up the capital of the minority and the civilisation steadily decays until the inferior population is swept away to make room for fitter people.’

In ‘Janus in Modern Life’ Petrie gave a detailed study of this crisis. The consumption of the resources of the Roman Empire, from the second century, when democracy was dominant, until the Gothic kingdom arose on its ruin, is the best known example, and therefore Petrie used it. The Romans, while they remained farmers and were only part-time soldiers, did well. The first great step in decline, which bore centuries of bitter results, was the favouring of the townsman against the countryman. The voter in Rome could push laws to his own advantage in the hurly-burly of the public assembly while the countryman was working hard in the furrow miles away. The conquered provinces had to yield tribute, grain came pouring into Rome, and why should not this abundance benefit the citizen by being sold at a low price? When the Romans went in for foreign conquest and became professional soldiers, their conquests afforded them abundance of food and slaves. Slaves brought home were put to work on the land, which work ceased to be fit for a free man. The demobilised armies had to be served with bread and circuses. The resultant exactions brought it about that many citizens retired on a small competence rather than endure such burdens and there was a general decline of industry and commerce. The state gave doles. Labour was directed, private property discouraged. Maximum prices were fixed. Hence food was not produced where a profit was prevented nor was it transported beyond the distance within which the maximum price paid.

Petrie headed the first chapter in 'Janus in Modern Life' 'Character the Basis of Society.' Happiness, he maintained, is essentially dependent on character and is largely determined by it. There goes on a process of natural selection of persons of character. The main source of new men of ability in Britain is sturdy Puritan stocks that have long practised self-denial and hard work.

Petrie delivered a frontal attack on main tendencies in our civilisation :

'The doctrine of equality of wages in a trade is a double injury : it encourages the most incapable man that can possibly be squeezed into a trade and it discourages the capable man who is worth far more than the average. It must tend to drive capable men out of the trades, which they might have raised by their example and stimulus, into other lines where capacity can still earn its value.'

Similarly, boards and committees supplant personal responsibility :

'What is everybody's business is nobody's business, and when each person feels that he is not personally responsible, a numbness ensues which is characteristic of such bodies. Men, any one of whom would act sensibly when alone, will succumb to the paralysing sense that they need not think because nine other men are doing so.'

The American ambassador to Russia who wrote 'Mission to Moscow,' Mr Joseph Davies, when asked why he had informed his government about Russia in a way that other governments were not informed, replied, 'I am a business man, accustomed to making judgments on situations in which it was *always important to me personally* to recognise facts when I see them and not misread them ; whereas in any bureaucratic organisation there is always a tendency to report to chiefs what the chiefs want to hear.' A letter to 'The Times' recently said, 'The plain fact is that practically no assistant will devote to a business anything like the interest and long hours given as a matter of course by the owner. In production costs this makes all the difference.' It had been found so with small holdings : they can be profitable only when run by a man, his wife, and their own family.

The opposite tendency in our civilisation Petrie characterised thus :

'One man is forbidden to lay more than three hundred bricks a day, another forbidden to make more than so many glass dishes, another forbidden to tend more than one machine. In every trade where a selfish, shortsighted policy has gained its way, there is this system, which is doing inconceivable harm to character. The compulsory glorification of sloth is the most deleterious misfortune that can happen to a man. The wreck of wars, pestilence, and famine will have a more hopeful prospect than that of a people sunk in organised sloth.'

The Bricklayers' Union, Petrie goes on, cannot be competed with from abroad except by means of imported houses. Hence this union has raised wages and cut down work from eight hundred bricks laid daily to two hundred and seventy or three hundred and thirty in different standards now. By raising the cost of labour to about three times the amount, the cost of building as a whole must be nearly doubled. The dearness of the lodging of the poor is really due to this.

Owing to the weakening of character in peace-time, we too have to have our bread and circuses—'pints, pictures, perms, pools, smokes.' No reasonable person would cavil at reasonable relaxation and indulgence, but it is pertinent to ask how many people there are in the country to-day who would exchange a ballot-paper for a correct forecast in a Football Pool. Petrie pointed out the wrong transvaluation of values which attaches so much importance to whether one contestant is a minute trifle better than another in a game or race. The whole interest of gambling, he says, implies a craving for excitement apart from personal exertion which is demoralising to the sense of work; it results in unearned fluctuations, which induce a wasteful habit; and it is based on the essentially ungentlemanly principle of benefiting by the loss of another, whereas all honourable gain is by the sharing of the benefits of labour. Besides the waste of time and labour, it acts injuriously in producing a restless, incapable type of mind, brought forward latterly in motoring, and also by creating a false social atmosphere in which the business of life is contemned and treated as drudgery, instead of being a main subject of interest and emulation.*

* Contrast Sir Richard Acland, leader of Common Wealth: 'I imagine that the thrill of driving a railway engine eventually wears off. These

These abuses will not be checked except by great disasters which compel the population to adopt a more energetic mode of life.

If any form of communism is to succeed, there must be a fixed minimum of labour compulsory on each member. If there is to be any private *peculium* outside of the share of common produce, the able man will rise to a privileged position. Mediocrity hates ability, and in a uniform community mediocrity must be dominant and ability persecuted. The energy and initiative needed to start new work and improvement, which is essential, is suppressed.

If a business can be run abroad with a markedly lighter burden of taxation and other limitations imposed at home, what is the result? There can be very serious consequences to heavy taxation. The Government says, 'If you spend your money on what is going to benefit the world, improving cultivation, building railways, opening the waste places and making them bloom, we will apply cumulative taxation, whereas if you spend your money in consuming goods and services, we will take only simple taxes.' As was said the other day, a man used to be proud of owning a bit of property; now he is treated as a malefactor. Leave a million pounds in the hands of people who have worked for it and they will spend most of it in useful investment that will bear fruit: scatter it over a hundred thousand people and most of it will be eaten up in luxuries or lost.

What light have Petrie's ideas to throw upon the legislation confronting us? This legislation is characterised by the folly of popular clamour. There is a great time-lag in popular ideas. Reason is meretricious unless wedded to fact, but the Age of Reason still dominates our legislation. It is held to be self-evident, not only in America, that all men are created equal. Could anything be more untrue? When Petrie was President of the British Association, in his presidential address he said that if only a few hundred persons were taken out of history, we should be living in the Stone Age. In 'Janus

things just cannot be life. It is the other things I have mentioned—dance halls, carnivals, sports, books, holidays, friends, love, spare time, these things are life.'—'The Forward March,' 1941, p. 88.

in *Modern Life* ' he said that if ten thousand men could be picked out of any one country so as to remove the most fruitful minds, that country would come to an entire standstill. (The main hope lies not in mass education but in the development of able individuals of high character.) All our new legislation ignores the fact of heredity. In ' *Our Towns: A Close-up* ' it is shown that squalor is often due not to bad housing or poverty: the children investigated were proved to be suffering from lack of parental care. Less than 10 per cent. of the children of this country in peace-time were undernourished, and many of them not because of poverty. Yet family allowances are to be squandered on all. Family allowances have been supported by the plea that they will increase population. But where tried they have not done so, and if they do, they will tend to increase it at the lower end of the social scale. This is what Petrie had to say on the issue at stake:

' The right end to begin at is by insisting on hard work and tidy living, under penal enactments. To begin at the sentimental end, as is now the fashion, is to degrade the whole race by swamping it with the neglectful, dirty, and wasteful stocks of low type in our midst.'

Petrie was in favour of differentiation: the legislation now before us is all in the equalitarian direction.

As regards education—in real life children develop at different ages, but, for convenience in administration, they are graded by age, and examinations at a tender age determine once and for all the future of a child. Before the new Education Act was drawn up there was no investigation into the quality of the education being given and to be given. That being given has been rightly stigmatised by Mr Charles Morgan as 'anæsthetic'—that is to say, on a quite false theory of education, the child has to be entertained and is almost entirely spared drudgery. In the Council schools there are no regular examinations except those set by the teachers themselves. In any town the employers—the postmaster, the stationmaster, the editor—will tell you that boys and girls leave school unable to read, write, spell, or do sum, decently, and with appalling ignorance. Telegraph boys are taught, not the technique of their work, but reading, writing, and arithmetic.

In spite of the differing ages at which children develop, all are to be kept in the present schools until the age of sixteen, in spite, too, of a mass of evidence against the unwisdom of this totalitarian procedure.* Take, for example, 'The Peckham Experiment,' by Pearse and Crocker. This is the report on eight years' work by a group of scientists :

' We have been very impressed with the difference we have observed in the physique and balance of development of boys who go to work at 14 as compared with those who remain at school until they are 16, 17, or 18. In the former there is an all-round robust functional development, often in spite of adverse industrial conditions, while those who continue at school seem overgrown—rather like an etiolated shoot—as though development were distorted as a result of the sequestered atmosphere of school. This was an unexpected observation to us and will, we believe, prove so to the reader. First, it was arresting in view of the policy of extending school education, with its present age- and sex-segregation, up to 16 or even 18 years of age, and second, in view of the acknowledged shortcomings of the modern industrial field in producing what we conceive to be healthy conditions for the adolescent.'

In the new Education Act, while provision is made for three types of secondary school, Grammar School, Modern School, and Technical School, no provision is made for selecting children for them.

Petrie in his day took a poor view of modern tendencies in education. Owing to the herding together of large masses of children and so weakening family types, he said, it is mainly deleterious. Compulsory games and so on militate against individual development. Those who are going to be the best workers in after life may not be the best to cram with book-work.

So much for education. Under the Government's national insurance and other schemes there are to be heavy taxes which will work against our vital export trade. A married man having no children and employed at 3*l.* 5*s.* per week will, if he become unemployed, receive 2*l.* 19*s.* 8*d.* per week, cease to pay contributions, and save other expenses. What inducement is there to get work ? And

* Some of it was published by me in 'The Times Educational Supplement,' May 1, 1943.

Vol. 283.—No. 566.

what of the strain on doctors in certification for sickness benefit? In general, heavy taxation tempts men to escape income tax by earning less.

Because a small part of the community was in want, huge distributions are to be made to the vastly larger portion not in want, thus encouraging prodigality. The flat rate, in so far as it is applied, ignores the fact that the greatest inequality is the equal treatment of the unequal. It takes no account, for example, of difference of rent. In spite of the pretence of equality, the independent worker will have to pay 4s. 2d. instead of 3s. 10d. per week, yet he will not get unemployment benefit, nor sickness benefit for the first four weeks of illness, during which he will have to maintain his contributions. That is to say that the shopkeeper, the small-holder, the independent, self-reliant citizen, is to be discouraged. Class IV of the community will have to pay 3s. 4d. per week and yet will get neither unemployment nor sickness benefit. Under pretence of equal benefits there is to be imposed heavy additional selective taxation.

The popularity of equalitarian theory among us is the more extraordinary in light of the fact that it was tried out in Russia and abandoned. In order to get production increased, Stalin ordained that wages must be paid according to labour performed. In order to make differences in wages real, he abolished the rationing of consumption-goods and restored the uniform purchasing power of money and supplied 'luxury' goods and services. Shvernik, head of the trade unions, declared: 'The trade unions should completely reorganise the wage system with a view to abolishing all absence of personal responsibility and all wage-levelling. The piece-work system must be adopted to the maximum degree.' In Britain before the war 10 per cent. received 45 per cent. of the national income: in Russia in 1939 11 or 12 per cent. received 50 per cent. of the national income. There, not only are wages differentiated according to production, but so also are the social services benefits. National insurance as inspired by Sir William Beveridge aims at equal benefits: in so far as they are unequal, it is the enterprising who are penalised. But in Russia, not only does a man who produces more get a higher wage but his social insurance benefits are paid in proportion to his wages. Perhaps the

most astounding of Stalin's revolutions, in absolute contrariety to the English Education Act of 1944, was as follows :

'The principle of free educational facilities has been abandoned, and higher education is now confined to those who are intellectually capable of profiting by it and whose parents have the means to pay the necessary fees.'

In Russia the workers are encouraged to lend their savings to the state, which pays up to 8 per cent. 'The right of personal property of citizens in their income from work and in their savings, in their dwelling-houses and auxiliary husbandry, in household utensils and in articles for personal use and comfort, as well as the right of inheritance of personal property of citizens is protected by law.'

But in Russia not only is production incited by differentiated reward : failure to produce a prescribed minimum leads to disciplinary action. This was such that when the Red Army was reorganised in 1941 the transition from labour discipline to military discipline was no great step. What military discipline became is testified to by Walter Kerr's 'The Russian Army,' published by Gollancz. No Red Army man in the course of training was likely to have any time to himself before lights-out except perhaps half-an-hour, in which he was supposed to write a letter home or take care of his equipment or study. Mr Kerr points out how frighteningly severe are the penalties for breaches of military regulations. A man can be shot for an offence that in the United States would lead only to the guard-house. An officer can be broken and given an eight-year suspended prison sentence for overstaying his leave. Cadet colleges modelled on those of Tsarist times have been restored with their principle of segregation of officers from men.

The Diplomatic Correspondent of 'The Times' recently reporting on Russia stressed the extremely high pay and many precious privileges enjoyed by leading officers and officials, the sharpening of distinctions between ranks, the decided increase in rewards and incentives for the intelligent and the industrious generally. The sons and daughters of high-ranking officers and officials are having an easier time and a better start in life than the families of most unskilled and semi-skilled workers.

It is a dangerous paradox that while so many people in this country have been so admiring Russia, they oppose the methods whereby Russia achieves her efficiency.

Can the economic stimulus be eliminated without serious results? With war-time economic security in many walks of life, we have seen the effect on production of goods and service—for example, with coal miners and 'bus conductors and conductresses. Sir Stafford Cripps has said that after the war it will not be possible to discharge anyone from employment for unsatisfactory work. If we remove the economic rein, and self-discipline is not adequate, discipline will have to be imposed, worker will report worker, as in Russia, and our life be corrupted by espionage.

The claim is being made for equal pay for men and women. By age-long adaptation woman is domesticated and can do without domestic help, whereas the man has to pay for it. Anyone who knows teachers knows that it was the unmarried woman teacher who could afford to have extensive holidays abroad, while the man teacher had to spend his holiday at a home holiday resort. Thus in this profession men are socially inferior to women: 'equal' pay will greatly increase this disparity. The occupations in which it is enforced men will tend to leave, and where employers have to pay men and women equal salaries, they will in many cases prefer men but will not be able to get enough. This at a time when, in the teaching profession, for example, men are so badly needed. For older boys to be taught by women is not desirable, as American experience has proved. When it is found that enough men do not come forward, higher salaries will be offered for men than women.

As against the popular demand for public ownership it should be noted that in the war the munitions that won were produced by free-enterprise countries. Different firms directed by different minds and employing a variety of experts in competition produce better than state unified organisation.

It is a widespread fallacy that a man can grow rich only by exploiting other people. On the contrary, a man can be a millionaire and leave the country in debt to him—men with a flair for organisation like the first Lord Leverhulme, like Lord Nuffield. A correspondent to 'The

Times' recently wrote that society now says to the successful business man :

'You may have been small once, but you have shown that you are too efficient. Whereas you paid wages to only five people, you now pay wages to five thousand. Whereas once only two or three hundred of the public showed their confidence in you by giving you 2,000*l.* worth of trade a year, now tens of thousands of persons are showing a preference for the things you make. You are too efficient, you find too much work, you pay too much wages, you are now Big Business, you must be controlled.' This correspondent continued: 'Knowledge of the point at which the community would say this to a man is desirable. He could then relax effort, so that no work above this level would be provided, no incomes found, he could enjoy all the privileges of the small man.'

Samuel Butler in 'Erewhon,' published in 1872, wrote, 'He who makes a colossal fortune in the hosiery trade, and by his energy has succeeded in reducing the price of woollen goods by the thousandth part of a penny in the pound—this man is worth ten professional philanthropists.'

Apart from the deleterious effect of heavy taxation on our export and home trade, a great deal of the benefits promised by the legislation now before us will be neutralised by the taxation of alleged beneficiaries. During the war there has been a great redistribution of the national income: those whose incomes are under 500*l.* a year receive 5,000,000,000*l.*; those over 500*l.* a year, 1,000,000,000*l.*

This country is falling between the two stools of America and Russia. Under communism, a country is kept on a war footing in peace-time: it is rationed, and capital is set aside to provide machinery. In America, firms are allowed to accumulate capital and buy labour-saving machinery—which the workers work. But in Britain, we refuse the imposed discipline of communism and at the same time by heavy taxation and trade union recalcitrance prevent the use of machinery, and by heavy taxation and wrong public opinion induce people to escape the burdens on increased incomes and evade responsibility and so discourage production.

Here, then, in our day and generation the prophecies of Sir Flinders Petrie are being fulfilled. He has suffered the fate of Cassandra—of having prophesied truly but not been believed.

R. F. RATTRAY.

Art. 7.—JAMES BOSWELL IN THE NEWER LIGHT.

THE one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the death of James Boswell is an appropriate occasion for taking stock of the extremely fruitful researches concerning the prince of biographers during the past twenty years—researches that have been greatly facilitated by the discovery of a mass of Boswell's manuscripts which, two generations ago, Dr Charles Rogers categorically declared to have been wholly destroyed. Rogers, however, was not entirely blameworthy, since he relied on a footnote in the fifth edition of the 'Life of Johnson,' in which Malone professes inability to verify a letter of Johnson to Boswell, 'the original being burned in a mass of papers in Scotland.'

Boswell's descendants may have consigned some of his manuscripts to the flames, but the greater portion still exist. Of recent years rich hoards have been discovered in Scotland and Ireland. Most of this material has gone to America where scholars have been at work upon it over a protracted period. Much of this material is now in print. Perhaps the most important find has been Boswell's 'Private Papers,' which were found in Malahide Castle in Ireland. Acquired by Colonel R. H. Isham, they were taken to America, where the first six volumes (folio and quarto) were prepared for the press by Geoffrey Scott and published in 1930 in New York, the edition being limited to 570 copies. Unfortunately Scott died while his labours were far from completion, and the editorial task devolved upon Professor F. A. Pottle, who, during the period 1930-34, published other twelve volumes, making eighteen volumes in all. Boswell's 'Private Papers,' owing to its inordinate length and expensive form, is not readily accessible, but a useful Index has been published.

The discoveries referred to, together with the labours of research scholars, have created what is virtually a new literature about Boswell. First came Professor Tinker's two-volume edition of Boswell's correspondence which fully merits the editor's claim that, besides furnishing the largest amount of information outside the 'Life of Johnson,' reveals facets of the biographer that find no place in his masterpiece. Six years later, there was given to the world the first instalment of the 'Private Papers,' in which more than 6,500 persons are mentioned—the whole forming a

gallery of personages which it is necessary to know in order to understand the literary history of the second half of the eighteenth century. The recovery of the 'Private Papers' was confidently predicted to be the final round-up as regards manuscript sources. But in 1936 Professor C. C. Abbott sprung another surprise by publishing 'A Catalogue of Papers relating to Boswell, Johnson, and Sir William Forbes.' Found at Fettercairn House, the documents constitute a supplementary source of information of the utmost value. In addition to a large number of letters addressed by Boswell to Forbes and more than a hundred letters from Johnson to various correspondents, the volume comprises summaries of over a thousand letters of which Boswell was the recipient. Professor Abbott's book strongly reveals the Scottish side of Johnson's biographer.

What, it may be asked, is the cumulative effect of the huge amount of material represented by the foregoing works, to which might be added Professor Pottle's 'Literary Career of James Boswell. Being the Bibliographical Materials for a life of Boswell'? To say that our knowledge of Boswell has been increased enormously is to say too little. The manuscripts now published have in fact revolutionised our ideas, not so much with regard to Boswell's character, the repellent features of which have all along been well known, but concerning his aims in life, likewise the nature and extent of his literary achievement. In other words, the illuminating discoveries of recent years (and it is doubtful if they are yet ended) call for a reconstruction of the traditional conception of Boswell's personality as well as of his position as a man of letters. The biography of the greatest of biographers is still to write. But material in richest abundance is at last available, and there is every prospect that before long the definitive 'Life of Boswell' will be forthcoming.

To understand how greatly the new Boswell differs from the old, it is essential to view the subject retrospectively. Formerly the trend of opinion was to abase Boswell. When a century ago Macaulay reviewed Croker's 'Boswell' he characterised the biographer of Johnson as 'a man of the meanest and feeblest intellect,' who, 'if he had not been a great fool he would never have been a great writer.' Macaulay's judgment, singularly

inept though it be, harmonised with current ideas of Boswell. It harped on his moral declension but ignored the fact that he possessed gifts which, among other things, exhibited him as a brilliant literary artist who gave us a unique specimen of the biographic art—a work which, as Sir Sidney Lee remarks, ‘always keeps with admirable tenacity to the fundamental purpose of transmitting personality.’ We also recognise Boswell as a ‘supreme champion of biographic frankness.’ And withal there is his unflagging industry in collecting authentic information from every conceivable quarter.

The plain fact is that the Victorian man of letters was not in a position to judge because he was far from having all the evidence before him. True, there was the self-revelation of Boswell in his famous book, which is saying much, since few writers have portrayed themselves with such semblance of actuality as does Boswell in the ‘Life of Johnson.’ Still it is undeniable that the *real* Boswell—the man of pronounced but puzzling individuality bent on achieving literary renown (and he did achieve it) apart altogether from his connection with Johnson—was hid from Macaulay and his contemporaries.

But the situation has been completely transformed by the bewildering array of fresh material relating to this extraordinary man. Two delusions that formerly were tenaciously clung to have been exposed. One is that had it not been for Boswell’s biographic triumph Johnson’s claim to remembrance would have been slight. The other is that the ‘Life of Johnson’ was Boswell’s sole claim to literary distinction. With the latter fallacy this article is immediately concerned.

It is now axiomatic that Boswell was not only the greatest of biographers but a diligent and impressive worker in many branches of literature. The ‘Life of Johnson’ is but one of the jewels in Boswell’s literary crown. He was an eminent man of letters before he made Johnson’s acquaintance. At thirty he was ‘the celebrated Mr Boswell’ whose contributions to letters had already earned him a European reputation. He was even better known than Johnson when the best work of the Cham of Literature was before the world—all except the ‘Lives of the Poets.’

Just as Boswell has been misjudged by the indiscretions

of his correspondence, so his literary career has been misinterpreted in terms of his superlative achievement as a biographer. So impressed are we with the uniqueness of the 'Life of Johnson' that we are oblivious of the fact that it does not represent the whole truth as regards Boswell's literary position. For one thing, he was a gifted and indefatigable journalist whose pen was constantly producing readable contributions on all sorts of subjects, most of which found their way into leading periodicals. The extent of Boswell's journalistic output may be gauged when it is remembered that the mere titles of his communications, both prose and verse, occupy some fifty pages of Professor Pottle's bibliography. And this excludes the long series of articles published under the generic title of 'The Hypochondriack' and now collected in two volumes. Furthermore, Boswell was partial to the pseudonym, and fugitive writings of his have been identified under nearly fifty pen-names. While the bulk of his journalistic articles, poems, and letters have now been traced, comparatively few, owing to their ephemeral interest, have been reprinted. Indeed by far the larger portion remain buried in contemporary newspapers and magazines. Unless we have some acquaintance with these spasmodic writings we can hardly hope to arrive at a sound valuation of the psychological forces at work in Boswell's elusive personality.

The immense range of his interests and the ease with which he turned them to literary account, is also impressively manifested by the numerous works he had the imagination to plan and in some cases to carry at least a few stages towards completion. Boswell in the capacity of literary projector deserves attention if only because there is afforded further proof of the amazing fertility of his mind. His schemes for new books were extremely diversified. Biography, history, topography, poetry, antiquities, lexicography—all were invaded. He even contemplated writing a novel as well as a story-book for children. He also wished to shine as an editor and translator of several of the masterpieces of foreign literature.

Scattered up and down the 'Life of Johnson,' the 'Tour of the Hebrides,' the 'Letters,' and elsewhere, references will be found to more than thirty projects by which he

hoped to extend his fame as an author. While these schemes were never brought to fruition, considerable progress with the writing was made in some instances. No doubt these unfulfilled enterprises are symptomatic of a lack of concentration, a futility that would have been absent in the case of a man of more virile character. Nevertheless, as has been indicated, they testify to Boswell's invincible desire to stand high in the world of letters.

For long it was a mystery how a biography of such conspicuous merit as the 'Life of Johnson' came to be written by a man in broken health, of irregular habits, and subject to fits of indolence. Equally surprising to former generations was how the most outstanding biography in the English tongue was the work of a person, who, as far as was known, never had given any indication of capacity to excel in the biographic art. Boswell's manuscripts have now made it abundantly clear that he had served some apprenticeship as a biographer, had in fact contemplated, and in one case at least made some headway with the writing of the lives of no fewer than four prominent Scotsmen before he began his labours on the 'Life of Johnson.'

Probably the earliest biographical undertaking with which Boswell dallied was one for the life of a Scotsman who belonged to the generation preceding his own, whom he may have seen but could not have known intimately, since the person concerned died when Boswell was only seventeen. On April 11, 1773 (the year of the Hebridean tour) Boswell told Johnson that he had 'some intention to write the life of the learned and worthy Thomas Ruddiman.' Johnson was delighted and promised to help 'to do honour' to the celebrated Latin scholar and champion of George Buchanan. Ruddiman was Keeper of the Advocates' Library and latterly printed a Jacobite newspaper. But the 'Life of Ruddiman' never matured. And perhaps it was well, for, apart from the serious disqualification of not knowing the man, Ruddiman was hardly a fit subject for biographic treatment according to the Boswellian method. Still he toyed with the idea, and in a letter to Johnson, dated Feb. 2, 1779, referring to 'Mr Falconer, a nonjuring bishop, a very learned and worthy man,' he adds: 'We had a good deal of curious

literary conversation, particularly about Thomas Rudiman' with whom Falconer had 'lived in great friendship.'

Boswell also contemplated writing a life of Lord Kames, the eminent Scots judge, philosopher, author, and farmer. In a letter to Temple, dated June 19, 1775, he writes: 'I dined yesterday with Lord Kames and his lady, *en famille*, and got from my Lord a good deal of his life. He says he will put down particulars of himself if I will put them together, and publish them. I think he has eminence enough to merit this.' Kames was a man of strong though not wholly attractive personality, and with a strain of eccentricity. Ramsay of Ochertyre, who knew him, says that 'a collection of Lord Kames' table talk . . . would be a precious and interesting relic of him.' And, in spite of Johnson's disparagement of Kames, Boswell thought so too. At any rate he began writing an account of the judge's career. The manuscript, which refers to the earlier portion of Kames's life, and is mainly anecdotal, existed in 1814 and was made use of by Lord Woodhouselee in the second edition of his 'Life and Writings of Henry Home of Kames.' Woodhouselee prints as footnotes six extracts from Boswell's manuscript.

Two years later Boswell proposed a much more promising subject for biographic treatment. This was Sir Alexander Dick of Prestonfield, a Scots laird who stood hardly lower in the biographer's esteem than Johnson himself. Dowered with a rich and magnetic individuality, Dick was an ornament of the medical profession, a kind of northern Sir Thomas Browne, for though he wrote no 'Religio Medici' but only negligible verse, he manifested all the Norwich physician's humour, acuteness, and learning. Like Browne, too, he maintained a voluminous correspondence with scientists, authors, and antiquaries. Furthermore, Dick had mixed with the world, was far-travelled, and had a genius for friendship.

On Jan. 12, 1777, Dick made this entry in his diary: 'Last week Mr James Boswell, my friend, expressed a desire to make a Biographical account of my life to my 74th year . . . I looked over many jottings . . . of past times, and we had some droll interviews, and it becomes, he says, very interesting.' Subsequently Dick himself prepared a rough sketch of his career which he

submitted to Boswell to 'animadvert upon.' Here, then, we see Boswell, seven years before Johnson's death, encouraging Sir Alexander Dick to furnish him with biographical particulars, and seeking by means of interviews to make a full and authentic record of his friend's opinions, 'being convinced,' as he says in his 'Life of Johnson,' 'that this mode is more lively.'

But the biography of Dick made slow progress. In October 1778 Boswell writes that 'some part of his manuscript' must be in Dick's possession. Then he adds: 'I must have locked it by so closely that I cannot find it at once. Pray let me know.' Boswell commends Dick for his judicious selection of material. 'You have very well and fully noted both the entail business and that of the turnpike roads, which are the great publick exertions of your life; as also the critical point of the Great Canal in which you was (*sic*) so spirited.' But there were other matters which, in Boswell's opinion, ought to be elaborated in the proposed biography—Dick's presidentship of the Royal College of Physicians, Edinburgh, his second marriage, his friends, and his correspondence. 'I could wish, too, that you would mark your *studies*, and, as far as you please, your *opinions*, in religion and politicks.' Regarding Dick's religious views Boswell adds a word of caution. 'I suppose you will mark them with your own hand. For though I believe them to be truly pious, yet there may be a liberality in them which may be misunderstood by your secretary (i.e. Sir Alexander's daughter). You are an elder [in the Church of Scotland] and, I trust, a brother Christian.'

Five years after the biography was first spoken of, on Nov. 25, 1782, Dick's diary contains this puzzling entry: 'Gave this day a missive to my worthy friend, Mr James Boswell of Auchinleck, that he may *after my Decease* have the perusal of my great collection of Letters from my friends for many years past for the purpose of his making out a Memory of my Life . . . and he promises to consult my son and friends when he has finisht.' It is difficult to ascertain the circumstances underlying this resolution. Had Boswell, one wonders, 'animadverted' rather severely on the material supplied him and caused Dick to decide that the biography was not practicable in his lifetime? That Dick should have underlined the words

'after my Decease' seems to imply that he relented after the work had been sufficiently advanced to enable him to form some idea of the kind of biography Boswell would produce. But whatever the reason the work was suspended. Dick died on Nov. 10, 1785, so that, in terms of the missive, Boswell was debarred from proceeding with the writing of the biography until after that date. By this time Samuel Johnson had been dead for eleven months, and Boswell had begun those labours which were to bring him immortality. So the 'Memory' of Sir Alexander Dick was never completed.

As a member of the Scottish Bar, Boswell was always deeply interested in the occupants of the Bench of the Court of Session, with many of whom, as the son of Lord Auchinleck, he was personally intimate. We have seen that he thought of becoming the biographer of Lord Kames, and, with the same intention, he was attracted to James Fergusson, whose judicial title was Lord Pitfour. According to Ramsay of Ochtertyre, Pitfour was 'one of the greatest and most popular lawyers of the period' besides being 'a man of probity and amiable disposition.' There is also the testimony of Lord Mansfield, who told George III that Fergusson was the first man at the Scottish Bar. Pitfour was judically-minded, dignified, well-mannered, which cannot be said of all the Scots judges of the time of Braxfield. He also was recognised as a popular laird and a prelate churchman.

According to a paragraph in Samuel Lyson's collection of Johnsonian cuttings, Boswell meditated writing Pitfour's life. The paragraph is dateless and without indication of the journal from which it was abstracted. The authenticity of the statement may therefore be impugned, but assuming its accuracy, the project encountered stern opposition from Pitfour's son. Here is the cutting :

'Anecdote of Mr Fergus[s]on, one of the present [Parliamentary] candidates for Aberdeenshire.—It is not true, as it has been whispered, that this young Gentleman never said a good thing. On the death of his father [Pitfour] Mr Boswell threatened to write his life. He had treasured up a great many of his *Saws*, and he mentioned in every company that he had a volume of Memoirs of the good old Lord in great forwardness. In consequence of this Mr Fergus[s]on went to him, and said :

"I hear, Mr Boswell, that you mean to publish Anecdotes of Lord Pitfour. Now I am come to tell you, Jamie, in few words, that if you do by G—I'll thrash you, for I am bound to protect my father's memory from *dullness* as well as detraction."

In the 'Tour of the Hebrides' Boswell mentions having 'preserved some entertaining and interesting memoirs of David Hume,' particularly 'when he knew himself to be dying,' and expresses the hope that he 'may some time or other communicate [them] to the world.' The manuscript was discovered in the Malahide Collection and is now in America. It consists of eight quarto pages, is in Boswell's handwriting, and is entitled: 'An Account of my last Interview with David Hume Esq. Partly revised in my Journal; partly enlarged from my Memory, 3 March, 1777.'

In 1773 Boswell bought from his uncle, Dr John Boswell, 'a curious Manuscript' containing the life of Sir Robert Sibbald, 'the celebrated Scottish antiquary and founder of the Royal College of Physicians at Edinburgh.' In the 'Life of Johnson' Boswell declares his intention of publishing the work, but like many another literary scheme of his, it was never carried out. Sibbald's 'Autobiography' did not see the light of day till 1833. A century later, in 1932, it was reprinted and issued as an appendix to a refutation of the charge that Sibbald forged Ben Jonson's 'Conversations' with the poet Drummond of Hawthornden—a refutation which, it is claimed, effectively dispels any lingering doubt there may be of Sibbald's integrity or the genuineness of the 'Conversations.' The 'Autobiography' is most entertaining and so illuminating regarding contemporary life in Scotland that it is regrettable that Boswell did not introduce it to the reading public with a commentary of his own.

A Life of James IV, an account of the second Jacobite rebellion, a history of Edinburgh, and a novel with Sir Alexander Macdonald of the Isles as the central figure—all were included in Boswell's list of literary projects. The subject of James IV, whom he characterises as 'the patron of my family,' cropped up during the Hebridean tour. When Johnson and his biographer viewed the tomb of Bishop Elphinstone in the chapel of King's College, Old Aberdeen, Boswell spoke of writing of this

noble founder of King's College 'in my History of James IV of Scotland.' The suggestion for an account of the Forty-Five came from Johnson. Boswell was enamoured of the idea, but feared the work could not be published in this country. In the end, however, he thought he 'might write so as to venture to publish my "History of the Civil War in Great Britain in 1745 and 1746" without being obliged to go to a foreign press.' But the proposed enterprise, which was entertained as late as 1785, was abandoned when he heard that John Home, author of 'Douglas,' was engaged on a similar work, though it was not published till 1802. The writing of a history of Edinburgh appears to have been thought of soon after Boswell's return from the Hebrides. At any rate, in 1774, he came across 'a curious Manuscript,' being the diary of Robert Birrel, a citizen of the Scottish capital, which, it occurred to him, might be of service in his 'intended History of Edinburgh.' But the occasion was inopportune, for William Maitland's folio on the subject was recently in the field, while Hugo Arnot was well advanced with a similar work, published in 1779. Arnot, like Boswell, was an advocate. He was a competent investigator, and produced a 'History of Edinburgh' which has not yet lost its value.

Boswell also aspired to be a lexicographer. Johnson had compiled an English Dictionary, why should he not produce a Scottish one? From the 'Life of Johnson' we learn that the idea had, in 1769, not only taken shape but had actually been begun. On October 19 of the year mentioned Boswell writes: 'I passed the evening with him (Johnson) at his house. He advised me to complete a Dictionary of words peculiar to Scotland, of which I showed him a specimen.' The incomplete manuscript was still to the fore in 1825, being then sold for sixteen shillings. By that time Dr John Jamieson's 'Etymological Dictionary of the Scottish Language' (1809) was before the world.

Topography also interested Boswell, and had he been a man of more definite purpose, we might have had a 'Journal of a Tour to the Isle of Man.' In 1776 he was looking forward to a visit to Manxland, and 'giving a full account of it.' Perhaps he had read, and was hoping to improve on, George Waldron's 'Description of the Isle of

Man' (1726), which Scott laid under contribution when writing 'Peveril of the Peak,' and a copy of which he presented to Joseph Train, his antiquarian friend. Train did what Boswell failed to accomplish—he brought out a topographical account of the Isle of Man which, if it falls short of modern standards, is at least a conscientious piece of work.

Boswell's masterpiece was in itself a resplendent tribute to Johnson. But this did not deter him from entertaining further plans for the exaltation of his hero. When Johnson was in Scotland Boswell blandly informed him that he was pondering 'a poetical letter' to him on his return to London. It was to be 'in the style of Swift's humorous epistle in the character of Mary Gulliver to her husband.' The Doctor was amused, but when he learnt that it would be written in Mrs Thrale's name he was ruffled and appealed to Boswell's 'sense of decency or delicacy.' Whereupon the biographer promised to substitute the name of Cole, the landlord of the Mitre Tavern, and Johnson breathed a sigh of relief. Happily, perhaps, for all concerned, 'the poetical letter' remained another unrealised dream.

In the year of Johnson's death, and when his health was causing much anxiety, Boswell, in a letter to Bishop Percy, vowed that he would publish 'as a regale to him (Johnson), a neat little volume, "The Praises of Dr Samuel Johnson, by Contemporary Writers." It will be about the size of Selden's "Table Talk," of which your Lordship made me a present.' Again the scheme came to nothing. A selection of cuttings from various periodicals entitled 'Johnsoniana' formed part of the library of Boswell's younger son James, and it is surmised that this was the material intended for 'The Praises of Dr Samuel Johnson.' Boswell also promised (1791) a complete edition of Johnson's poetry, in which he would 'with the utmost care ascertain their authenticity, and illustrate them with notes and various readings.' This was an enterprise that would have been executed *con amore*, since Boswell was of opinion that 'excepting his orthographic works, everything which Dr Johnson wrote was poetry.' But Boswell, probably exhausted by his labours on the biography, in the end relinquished the idea.

Other literary undertakings contemplated by Boswell

included an edition of Izaak Walton's 'Lives'; an essay on Edward Young, author of 'Night Thoughts,' of which he was an admirer; works in praise of Addison's poetry and John Gay's 'Beggar's Opera'; and two of his 'characteristical pamphlets,' the one against the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, the other 'An Appeal to the People upon the threatened project of involving Great Britain in a War with Russia in order to assist the Turks.'

And condescending to things of low estate Boswell was intrigued with the notion of writing a story-book for children 'in the style of the chap books.' The circumstances attending the origin of the work are narrated by Professor Pottle. In the library of Harvard College are three small volumes containing 83 chap-books, each volume bearing the binder's title 'Curious Productions.' On the fly-leaf of the first volume is written the following note:

'James Boswell, Inner Temple, 1763. Having, when a boy, been much entertained with "Jack the Giant-Killer," and such little Story Books, I have always retained a kind of affection for them, as they recall my early days. I went to the Printing Office in Bow Church Yard and bought this Collection and had it bound up with the Title of "Curious Productions." I shall certainly sometime or other write a little Story Book, in the style of these. It will not be a very easy task for me; it will require much nature and simplicity, and a great acquaintance with the humours and traditions of the English common people. I shall be happy to succeed for He who pleases Children will be remembered with pleasure by men.'

Had Boswell written his story-book for children, which with so much assurance he declares he will do, it would surely have been the most curious of all his literary performances. Moreover it would have been still another indication that we do wrong to assess the fame of this extraordinary man by his 'Life of Johnson' alone, but that, on the contrary he invaded, if he did not enrich, every department of literature.

W. FORBES GRAY.

**Art. 8.—JOHN CHARLES, VISCOUNT ALTHORP, THIRD
EARL SPENCER.**

ON Oct. 1, 1845, just one hundred years ago, Lord Spencer died—'and no man ever died with a fairer character or more generally regretted.' So wrote Charles Greville in his *Memoirs*, and he followed it up by devoting several pages to one 'whose own acquaintance with him was not intimate, but who had a great respect and esteem for him.' As the majority of Greville's epitaphs are uncomplimentary, this eulogy is specially interesting for he was always more ready to criticise than to praise.

Lord Althorp—to give him the name by which he is better known—was born at Spencer House on May 30, 1782; the eldest child of the Second Earl Spencer, who later presided over the Admiralty with so much success and who collected a large and famous library, and of his beautiful wife, Lavinia Bingham whose portraits by Sir Joshua Reynolds are so well known. His parents were friends of all the most brilliant people of a brilliant period, so his upbringing should have rendered him as cultured as were all the habitués of his father's house. Instead of this, he was awkward, shy, tongue-tied and ill-at-ease, and his personal appearance was not that of a 'man of fashion.' He himself has deplored the deficiency of his education, which his biographers have taken to mean that, owing to their social and other duties, his parents neglected him, but he probably meant that the usual standard of learning at a public school and university at the end of the eighteenth century was not high. However, on reading Lady Spencer's letters to her husband, there is no hint of this and she appears to have seen more of her children than did the parents of late Victorian times. In fact, according to her own lights, she was an exemplary mother and often complains that his grandmother, Lady Lucan, was so devoted to him that she feared he might be spoilt.

It has also been stated that he was so neglected that his earliest lessons were given him by a Swiss footman. Now in an establishment such as Lord Spencer kept, there was a nursery footman, whose duties will have been rather similar to those of a nursery maid, and Jean Martinet, who remained in the family for more than forty

years, held this post and, being a nice man, naturally took a great interest in his young charge. Lady Spencer's letters to her husband become almost monotonous in their praise of their only child, for their next living child was not born till over five years later (though they had several dead children in the interval). She continually refers to his beauty (as can be seen from Reynolds's picture), to his unselfishness and to his good-natured disposition, and tells him how happy she is to have two such perfect beings as her husband and son.

But she was just the wrong sort of person to deal with a boy of Althorp's nature, for she could not bear his slowness and his *gaucherie*. She was most ambitious for her children and wanted them to be quick and brilliant like herself; and as she could never hide her true feelings and was completely intolerant, she snubbed him so unmercifully that he sought refuge anywhere but in his own home. There can be very little doubt that, if he had been brought up without his difficult mother, he would have conquered much of the shyness and diffidence, which pursued him throughout life.

According to the custom which then prevailed, Althorp was sent to Harrow a month after his eighth birthday. Lady Clermont, dining at Spencer House that same evening, recounts how: 'Lord Spencer bore his going to school wonderfully well and after dinner at the time Lord Althorp used to come in, we were all a little grave.' He did not distinguish himself at school, though, on Speech Day 1798, he performed the Earl of Arundel's speech from Lord Lyttelton's life of Henry II. His letters, however, are full of accounts of the animals and pets which he kept. This characteristic remained with him through life, for he once confessed that his favourite pastime was to 'see sporting dogs hunt.' But not until he was about ten years old did he show that enthusiasm for riding and hunting which was to distinguish him during his early life.

His mother writes from Althorp on Dec. 17, 1792:

'Dear Jack took his first ride this morning and is delighted with his new horse, who carried him perfectly well and he insists upon it that he is not so wide between the legs as "Castlebar" whom he used to ride last year, which circumstance I did not know before. It was in the paddock behind the kitchen garden that took place this self-guided trot and he

took it with perfect ease and satisfaction so that I hope that he will really now take a liking to manly amusements, dearest, dearest boy ! He is as near perfect as it is allowed to humanity to be—in short to say all I can in his praise—he is worthy of being your son.'

Two days later she continues :

' A great event has happened in this part of the world. Our beloved Jack has just marched into this room with a fox's brush, which he has brought home after having been at the death of the creature whose behind it once graced. I confess this expedition was a surprise upon me and I was completely out of my wits when I heard he was gone a foxhunting, for no leave was asked, and, till you come home, I promise you that no other expedition of the kind shall be taken ; but away he went, the dear fellow, and he is now full of it and eager beyond expression in the description of this famous chace. They met at Gayton and killed immediately and then Daniel Gillam brought home our dear Nimrod and did not suffer him to go after the second fox. His horse carried him incomparably and he is not the least tired—at least he says so, but I have no doubt that he will be as stiff as a brick-bat by evening. I confess I wish he had not begun by going so far to cover, but as I said before, I was not consulted and as all has ended very well, I have nothing to do but to bless our stars.'

From this time for nearly thirty years Althorp was an enthusiastic foxhunter and even spent the summer months at the remote village of Brigstock in the middle of Rockingham Forest where the hounds were kennelled, with his friend but political opponent, Sir Charles Knightley of Fawsley. His father had given up the Althorp and Pytchley countries owing to his preoccupations at the Admiralty, but in 1808 Althorp's mastership started with the purchase of Mr. Warde's hounds for 1,000*l.* and with the engagement of Charles King as huntsman. He entered upon his mastership with his usual power of enjoyment, and it has always been said that these were the halcyon days of foxhunting in Northamptonshire. He kept 'Chace Books' as his father and his grandfather had done, and in them detailed most minutely each day's sport, even giving the names of the individual hounds and how they behaved. But though he rode hard, he was neither a good nor a polished horseman and was continually having falls, whereby he dislocated his

shoulder so often that his whipper-in was taught how to put it in by the surgeon at the Northampton Infirmary. It eventually became so loose that he put it out when opening a window at Althorp.

Until the end of his life he spent much time with his gun and though he never became a good shot, he enjoyed himself immensely not only at home but also with his friends at Holkham and Woburn and elsewhere. This enabled him to keep records, which he was very fond of doing, for not only did he write down everything he killed, but also the number of shots he fired.

To return to his education, from Harrow he went up to Trinity College, Cambridge, where his private tutor was the Rev. Joseph Allen (later Bishop of Ely), but at first he was extremely idle, for at that time it was the privilege of a peer's son to obtain a degree without having to pass examinations. This gave him much time to pursue his favourite amusements of hunting and racing, so he was amazed, when about to return to Cambridge, to hear his mother say (as he was leaving the Long Library at Althorp) after she had been questioning him : ' Jack, we expect you to take honours.' This, of course, referred to his College Examination. But he immediately sold his horses and worked so hard that he was not only placed in the First Class but was high in it. This led to a further success, for in his second year, he was declared the First Man of his Year, which caused quite a sensation for it was unusual, if not unique, for a nobleman at that time to attain such a high position.

After leaving Cambridge his parents sent him abroad, being enabled to do this by the brief Peace of Amiens, but he was forced to return hurriedly, much to his joy, when the fighting started again. This tour was a great disappointment to his parents for it brought him back just as unpolished and gauche as before and it awoke in him no love of art or knowledge of languages.

As it was at that time considered necessary for an eldest son to sit in the House of Commons—Althorp himself having wished to go into the navy—he was in 1804 elected for the borough of Okehampton, but on the death of Pitt in January 1806, he offered himself for the University of Cambridge ; this was considered by many to be a breach of good taste on the part of his violent

mother, as Pitt had been a friend of Lord Spencer's, but he was soundly beaten by Lord Henry Petty (later to be his colleague, Lord Lansdowne) though he was ahead of the third candidate, Lord Palmerston. After sitting for a few months for his father's borough of St Albans, he won the election for Northamptonshire after a severe struggle and continued to sit for his county until he succeeded to the peerage twenty-eight years later.

For the next year he held office as a Junior Lord of the Treasury in the Ministry of all the Talents, while his father was Secretary of State, but from 1807 onwards he, with the rest of the Whigs, was in opposition and did not take his Parliamentary duties at all seriously, for he spent most of his time hunting. He often posted hacks at an interval of ten miles (mostly on his father's property) on the road to Northamptonshire, so that he could gallop down after the division in the House to be in time for the meet of the hounds the next morning; and it is said that after hunting, he even drove back to London, a distance of seventy-two miles, so as to record his vote that same evening.

His life continued on its even tenor for several years until in 1809 the Commander-in-Chief, the Duke of York, was removed from his office because his mistress, Mrs Clarke, had been selling commissions in the army. He made his maiden speech on this occasion and took a leading part against the Duke. It is to the credit of both parties that when they met shortly afterwards at a review on Wimbledon Common, the Duke rode up to him and said:

'I am glad to have this opportunity of saying to you that I felt grateful to you for the way in which you brought forward the motion against me in the House of Commons. I knew of course that it was not in your private capacity but as the organ of your party, and I have always felt grateful to you for the consideration and friendly feeling to me with which you brought it forward. In the hands of some other man it might have been much more painful to me.'

The Adjutant General's son, Sir Harry Calvert, who recounts this anecdote, adds: 'The Duke doing this showed his feeling towards Lord Althorp, who was the object of such universal esteem.'

During the long years of Tory Government the Whig

Party was often divided and Althorp had to choose with which side he would join. His father, whom he loved, venerated, and admired, had always held moderate views. As we have seen he became a Tory when he followed Pitt and Lady Spencer, who never did anything by halves, had warned her son against all Whigs, but on his going up to Cambridge Althorp soon discovered that he much preferred his Whig to his Tory contemporaries. And when after the death of Pitt, Lord Spencer returned to his former political associates—including Fox, to whom he gave an annuity of 1,000*l.* a year—Althorp was very much relieved, though gradually he found himself going more and more to the left (as we should say) and choosing to vote with Samuel Whitbread and his more extreme followers. In the early nineteenth century the father's decision as to the doings of his whole family was final, so it was for Lord Spencer to decide as to whether his son should be allowed to continue to sit in the House when the latter's views were so dissimilar and so much more extreme than his own, but being a man full of common sense and being so well aware of his son's rectitude of principle and soundness of judgment, he permitted him to follow the policy that he considered right. And it is satisfactory to note that when the time came for the Whigs to return to office, both Lord Spencer and his son agreed on the great question of Parliamentary Reform.

During all these years he had avoided London society and had left Spencer House for lodgings in Albany, for he said he hated 'the life of a grandee.' He was still unmarried, which was a further cause of his mother's dissatisfaction with and disappointment in him. This small circle of society arranged the marriages of their children in what appears to us a very curious way, for it seems that they always wished their children to be united with those of their brothers or sisters, and the Spencers were much disappointed when their niece, Lady Caroline Ponsonby became engaged to William Lamb, as they said they were anxious for Althorp to marry her; and also another first cousin, Lady Harriet Cavendish (later Lady Granville) was nearly married to Caroline's brother, Duncannon, and when the latter married someone else she was afterwards sent to spend a month at Althorp for the purpose of marry-

ing her cousin there. Even Hartington, another cousin, though only fifteen at the time, made a great fuss and was miserable when Caroline became engaged.

But according to his mother, Althorp should fall in love with every heiress who appeared in London, and she was very much annoyed when he did not show any signs of proposing to Miss Tylney Long, the greatest heiress of her day. But at last he decided, at the age of thirty-two, to marry Esther, only child of Richard Acklom of Wiseton in Nottinghamshire. She was supposed to have an income of 10,000*l.* and the extraordinary way in which this marriage was arranged can best be told by his sister, Lady Lyttelton, written many years later :

‘ There was not a pretence of *love* in the case, Lady A. had been *refused* by, I believe, more than one young nobleman before to whom she had made overtures, being determined to become a great lady somehow ; she was in fact a vulgar person and a spoilt child. My brother, being as was his usual fate in terrible distress from debts, made up his mind (after taking a two hours’ walk in the Park to bring himself to it) to marry her, fancying her fortune greater than it proved to be when the incumbrances on Wiseton were discovered. From that time never was there a happier marriage, never more sincere and deep affection on both sides and never deeper grief in any widowed heart. The particular fault I have mentioned was remarkable and caused the extreme dislike with which she was always regarded by my poor mother.’

Lord Brougham gives a more pleasing account, saying Lady Althorp was a most excellent person as could possibly be and made an exceedingly good wife, but the only likeness of her—a miniature by Charles Jagger—certainly does not make her appear very attractive.

Brougham continues :

‘ The loss of Esther in 1818 was a dreadful blow. She was brought to town in a litter or Sedan chaise expecting to have a bad time and having remained too long at Wiseton. The loss of both mother and child was a dreadful affair. He was never quite on the same footing with his mother afterwards, supposing she had not shown sufficient feeling ; in this he was wrong, it was only her manner and also that she never could affect more than she really felt. When Lady Milton’s death happened in the end of 1830, I had a letter from him full of admiration of Milton’s bearing it so well and saying it was

quite an example of the use of religion. One night sitting in the House of Commons, he told me he concluded Milton would marry again as he certainly ought to do—and I immediately said (as I had often done before) that M— was not the only person who ought—and that most certainly he—A—ought. He said “Well, perhaps you may be right but however . . .” I said “Then only be not so decisive, for then you know how d—d obstinate a fellow you are.” He said again “Well perhaps.”

It is quite true that he never got over her loss; he gave up hunting and invariably wore a black coat which in those days denoted a parson or someone in mourning. He requests his brother to see that he is ‘placed in the family vault at Althorp that I may be near my beloved Esther; that in case our bodies rise in the place in which they are deposited as I think not improbable, we may appear before our Almighty Judge together at the last great day.’

It is, however, interesting to find that just before his father’s death in 1834, he asked leave of him to marry Frances, Lady Clinton, the sister of his brother’s wife and daughter of his cousin, William Stephen Poyntz; he seems to have been certain that she would accept him, instead of which she firmly and definitely refused him and soon afterwards was married to Sir Horace Seymour.

After he gave up hunting he started to breed shorthorn cattle and from henceforward his greatest interests were his farms in Nottinghamshire and Northamptonshire. When holding office, he was forced to confess that he opened the letters from his bailiff before his other letters, even if they were on important government business. The farm at Wiseton he ran regardless of expense, often losing as much as 3,000*l.* a year on it; whereas the farm at Brampton, near Althorp, was run at a profit.

The reasons for this are explained by his brother:

‘The way he used to consider this was that at Wiseton it was necessary to keep on cows of high pedigree though not profitable in the hope that they would breed; it was also necessary as the land was poor and heavily stocked to buy much food in order to have the herd in condition and to get the young bulls, of which there were usually eight or ten for sale, in such a state as might tempt purchasers. The Northamptonshire farm was for grazing and was managed

with a view to making it pay. He used to say that every person in his situation had expenses for their own pleasures—one hunted, another raced or another played, but that though a loser in his own amusement, he was doing good all the while and if he did not lose in that way, he should in some other.'

Not only did he become an excellent judge of cattle—the only addition to the pictures at Althorp made by him are twenty-six paintings of his bulls and cows—but he also greatly enjoyed making calculations and working out the value of the sheep and oxen, which were sold from his farms, to the minutest fraction as well as their pedigrees showing the degrees of the particular crosses to 0·0000.

For many years Althorp was President of the Smithfield Cattle Club, which he resuscitated after it had been in very low water, and in 1837, while addressing its members, he suggested the formation of the Royal Agricultural Society, pointing out that the Club was in the metropolis and was quite useless for the promotion of the general purposes of agriculture, but that the new Society would have no prospect of obtaining any useful results unless politics were scrupulously avoided at its meetings. He became the first President in 1839 and also helped to form the Yorkshire Agricultural Society, where he is said to have worked in his shirt sleeves arranging the show and placing the cattle in their proper places.

During all these years Althorp's character had become well-known for its Liberal principles, its unerring good judgment, and its care and attention to details. It was therefore obvious to all, when his party emerged out of opposition in December 1830, that he would be destined to take a leading part in the new government—to all except to Althorp himself, for he said that he had voted for so many measures in the minority that he would never be asked to take any part in any government; and even after King William IV had sent for Lord Grey, he still persisted in refusing to take office until he was assured that Lord Grey could not form a ministry without him. Only then did he most reluctantly consent, after Lord Grey had told him that he would willingly stand down in favour of Althorp becoming Prime Minister. But office life was absolutely repugnant to him and he went so far as to say that he was so miserable that he could never trust

himself to leave pistols lying about in his room, for he felt sure that he would try to end his misery by using them on himself.

To the surprise of all, the office which Althorp selected was that of Chancellor of the Exchequer—with the lead of the House of Commons—because, as he said, he thought he could do more good in that office than in any other, though his only experience was the love of calculations which has already been mentioned.

It was perhaps inevitable that the opposition should immediately begin to make fun of this plain tongue-tied man, who looked like a farmer with an unmelodious voice, who was unable to put two sentences together—no wonder that the caricaturists were delighted to have such an easy target. But friends and opponents alike soon came to realise that: 'Spotless in private character, manly and disinterested and wholly free from malice in public life, Althorp commanded the respect of all—the warm affection of those within the sphere of his acquaintance.'

Lord Grey's motto was 'Peace, Retrenchment, and Reform'; the first was none too secure owing to the state of Europe and the Duke of Wellington's late administration had been an economical one, so the great reduction of taxation, which the advent to office of the Whigs had led the country to expect, could not be realised and Althorp's first budget was unpopular on this account, and also as he had to withdraw his proposed duties upon transfers of real and funded property owing to the vigorous attacks of Peel, Goulburn, and their followers.

As Althorp loathed being in office and had no ambition, and as nothing ever excited him, he was always on the slightest provocation threatening to resign, so he must have been for that reason a difficult member of the Cabinet and Lord Grey no doubt spent many weary hours in persuading him to remain in office. Much to the disapproval of his later Victorian nephews, he wrote an account of all its proceedings to his father (they being of course confidential and no minutes being then kept), so we are able to follow his attitude upon the various questions which were discussed, such as the new Poor Law, the Factory Act, and the Abolition of Slavery, but though these and other Acts were very important, it is the great Reform

Act which stands out as the most famous measure passed by this government.

Althorp had not been a reformer all his life, but by the time that he took office, he realised that Parliamentary Reform was long overdue and therefore entered into the preparation of the Bill with much enthusiasm. Though not a member of the small committee with which the Bill originated, yet he learned every detail of it and his knowledge respecting even the smallest and most unimportant clause was almost uncanny and is a tribute to his good memory. With the whole of the opposition arrayed against him, he exhibited such good temper and such self-control that as night after night he stood up to these Tory lawyers and others—never once did he falter, never once was he irritated, and never once did he show any ignorance of any portion of the Bill.

The controversy over the passing of the Bill is too well-known to need recounting here—its defeat in the House of Lords, the resignation of the ministers, the Dissolution, the bringing in of the second bill, the negotiations with the King over the creation of enough peers to ensure its passing the Upper House and finally the abstentions which allowed its passing into law. During all this violence and turmoil, Althorp's reputation grew, and it is said that since that time no one has had such influence in the House both with foe as well as with friend. On one occasion Croker, in an excellent speech, moved an amendment, to which Althorp rose and replied that he had made some calculations which he had inadvertently mislaid, but he could only say that if the House could be guided by his advice they would reject the amendment—and this they did.

Ireland, which has been the cause of the fall of so many ministries, finally compelled Grey and Althorp to resign in the summer of 1834 and Melbourne became Prime Minister, but only on the understanding that Althorp would serve with him, so the latter was compelled to continue in the same office. This time, as it happened, it was not for long, because Lord Spencer died on November 10, and Althorp took this opportunity of retiring altogether from public life. The King also for the same reason dismissed Melbourne on the pretext that he was not strong enough to carry on without Althorp's presence leading the House

of Commons—in reality His Majesty was wishing to find an excuse for ridding himself of the Whigs—this is the last occasion on which a sovereign has dismissed an administration without the advice of his ministers, and it annoyed Althorp considerably to be the innocent cause of the removal of his friends. But his release from office made him once again happy and he firmly resolved never again to submit to it.

His father left his property very much embarrassed, for he had for many years lived above his income. Althorp was well aware of the difficulties to which he would succeed, for he had insisted that his father and mother should not alter their mode of living; he told them that he did not care one farthing what were his income and expenditure, so they continued to the end of their lives to live in their usual extravagant style. Whether they were right or wrong in yielding to his suggestion, and whether he was right in proposing it, is a matter of opinion, though it gives another instance of his unselfishness. But this forced him to spend his remaining years in living in the most economical way and in selling land to pay off the mortgages. So swiftly and so thoroughly did he do this that on his death eleven years later, his brother found all the incumbrances paid off.

Besides farming, Althorp spent much of his time in reading, making calculations, and in county business (which had always played a great part of his life's work) and at one time carried on a correspondence with Brougham on metaphysics and natural theology.

He died with his usual simplicity, for after arranging his affairs, he said that his life upon earth had been so happy that he was sure his future life would be just as happy. He was only sixty-three years old, but his fear of gout was such that he had for years starved himself, so when he had an attack of bladder trouble, he had not the strength to withstand it and died after a few days illness.

No more fitting epitaph can be given him than that which his friend, Lord John Russell, wrote in the 'Edinburgh Review':

'He was plain in manner and dress, but a short intercourse disclosed the scholar, the gentleman, and the statesman. For he possessed, with the entire absence of all artificial politeness, the most genuine courtesy of behaviour to all who

approached him. His kindness of heart shone in the most casual, as in the most cordial intercourse; and while the intimacy of his friendship was a treasure reserved for few, the equanimity of his temper and the charity of his judgments extended to all who approached him in the conduct of affairs, or were opposed to him in political enmity. He had no jealousy, no envy, and perhaps too little ambition. . . .

'But above all his opinions upon questions both speculative and practical were guided by a humble reliance on the Goodness of God; and a conviction that he was bound in whatever he might think or do—whether in following or resisting his own inclination—to follow the Law of Christ.'

SPENCER.

Art. 9.—PURE MILK.

CONFRONTED with the fact that, whereas two-thirds of the world's population are producers of food, an even larger proportion suffer from either hunger or malnutrition, the Conference on Food and Agriculture, representing all the United Nations, met at Hot Springs, Virginia, U.S.A., in May 1943. The topic of their deliberations was the production, distribution, transport, and consumption of food throughout the world. As at least half the human race, even in peace-time, have sub-normal health, and, as of all 'protective' foods (that is foods most effective in building up resistance to disease), milk has, in the opinion of experts, an outstanding priority, it merits special consideration at this critical period in the world's history, when all men of vision realise that the welfare of humanity cannot prudently be dissociated from that of any section of it. Incidentally, widespread malnutrition is a potent stimulant to war and to the conditions which produce war-mongers. Great Britain's record as regards milk is unfortunately far from satisfactory. She must put her own house in order, if she seeks in the sphere of health and nutrition to point the way to other countries.

There is no more complete food than milk, and none more wholesome, if free from dirt and from taint. One result of war-time feeding and rationing is that the British

public has learned to appreciate much more than in pre-war years the high food value of milk, and indeed to admit the justification of its description as the A1 priority food of the nation. The public health schemes for supplying a special allowance of milk to infants as well as to pregnant and nursing mothers have not only emphasised the importance of milk to these special categories of the population, but also the resulting occasional shortage of supply has brought home to others its true value. Indeed, despite the welcome increase in recent years in the total output of liquid milk, there would appear to be still a large unsatisfied demand. The increasing public interest in milk was reflected recently in the debate which took place in the House of Lords on April 11 last, in the course of which every aspect of the problem was authoritatively discussed. All participants in the debate, including the spokesmen of the Ministries of Agriculture and of Health, testified to the urgent need for a greatly enhanced production of clean and safe milk and the desirability of taking energetic measures to improve the productivity and the health of British dairy cattle.

There is no necessary association between 'clean' milk and 'safe' milk. It is possible to have a clean milk which is dangerous and a dirty milk which is safe. For human consumption, however, milk that is both clean and safe is highly desirable. In the above debate Lord Moran, the President of the Royal College of Physicians, significantly remarked that 'it is not easy to understand why microbes in water cause such alarm and dismay to the public, while microbes in milk are accepted with equanimity.' But this strange inconsistency is rapidly giving place to a saner outlook. Indeed, the average intelligent consumer is rapidly coming to share the view of the medical profession that, until 'safe' milk is made generally available, this beverage cannot be unreservedly recommended as a human food. Pasteurisation is a process which, when carried out efficiently, renders an unsafe milk safe without any appreciable diminution in its nutritive value. It has for many years been a subject of lively contention, to the disadvantage of all branches of the dairying industry, and the mental confusion of the consuming public. Critics of the process are apt to forget that, in effect, it takes place in every normal cup of tea and in every milk pudding.

Fortunately it is now agreed that—at least until a far higher standard of quality and purity can be guaranteed—pasteurisation is in the best interests of producer, consumer, and distributor alike. The knowledge that all milk will soon be obtainable from disease-free cattle or made safe by pasteurisation will encourage both its production and consumption. It is also likely to lead to a greater appreciation by the public of the difficulties and complexities of the dairying industry.

This industry is not only one of our largest food industries. It is one of the largest of all industries. Summarising figures furnished by Dr J. G. Davis of the National Institute for Research in Dairying, its total capital has been estimated at over 460,000,000*l*. It employs about 400,000 workers and produces about 1,300,000,000 gallons of milk annually, equivalent to 725,000 tons in weight of dry food which is 100 per cent. digestible. The average price per gallon in 1937–38 was 1*s.* 2*d.* and the total sale value about 70,000,000*l*. At that time, of a total of nearly 7,000,000 cattle about 3,000,000 were milking females, of which roughly 2,240,000 might be deemed to be in milk at any one time. An average cow produces just over 45 cwt., or 500 gallons, in a year, equivalent to three or four times her own weight, up to ten times as much milk as she would do under natural conditions. Of the milk produced, slightly over 70 per cent. is in normal times sold in liquid form and the remainder is converted into butter (7 per cent.), condensed milk (6·5 per cent.), cheese (5 per cent.), fresh cream (4 per cent.), milk powder (1·25 per cent.), tinned cream (0·75 per cent.), and other products (0·5 per cent.). The distributive side of the industry is no less important. It employs nearly 100,000 workers and has a capital of about 130,000,000*l*. The retail sales of liquid milk in 1940–42 amounted to 125,000,000*l*. and of milk products in 1937–38 to nearly 30,000,000*l*.

The average weekly expenditure on food per household in 1939 was about 32*s.*, or 9*s.* per head. In some areas as much as a quarter of the households spent less than 5*s.* per head on food. It is obvious that in these cases it was almost impossible to avoid malnutrition, the corresponding cost of the B.M.A. standard diet being 6*s.* 8*d.* Of the total persons included in a recent authori-

tative survey, 21 per cent. were below the 'poverty line,' and of the children 39 per cent. The percentage of these cases increased with the number of children in the household, so that malnutrition was to be found where it is most to be deprecated.

The most valuable contribution of milk to the human dietary is its protein, calcium, and vitamin B₂ (riboflavin) content, and to a less extent vitamins A, B₁ and C; * for a five-year-old child the riboflavin content is relatively more important. Milk is poor in iron, copper, and other trace elements, but the young suckling has several months' supply stored in the liver. Milk is also poor in vitamins B₁ and D and rather poor in C. For the preservation of vitamin C, milk should always be kept in the dark. Sunlight can destroy or unstabilise all the vitamin C in a bottle of milk in half an hour. Although milk is not specially cheap as a source of essential constituents, it is not excessively dear for any one of them, and is certainly good value for calcium, phosphorus, and potassium. Cheese, which may be regarded as a concentrated form of milk, is cheap for protein, fat, calcium, and phosphorus.

It is reasonable to ask to what extent improved health or physique can be traced to increased milk consumption. Experiments both in this country and in the United States have shown that an addition of from two-thirds of a pint to one pint of milk daily to the ordinary diet of school children may increase their rate of growth by from 5 to 20 per cent., while markedly improving their general health. Figures have recently been published by the Glasgow Public Health Department which show that children of five and of thirteen years of age were taller and heavier in 1943 than children of the same ages before the war. This is attributable, it is thought, to the larger consumption during the war of milk, improved bread, and

* The vitamins are accessory food factors required only in minute quantities, but nevertheless essential to complete bodily and mental well-being. They all tend to increase resistance to disease, although vitamin A is credited with being of special value in this connection. Deficiency in vitamin A undoubtedly results in impaired growth and is generally associated with eye and skin lesions. The B vitamins are mainly concerned with nervous troubles. Vitamin B₁ deficiency may give rise to neurasthenic, nervous, and circulatory disorders. Vitamin B₂ (or riboflavin) deficiency induces characteristic lesions of the skin, mouth, and eye. Vitamin C is the anti-scurvy factor and vitamin D is the factor essential to the avoidance of rickets, particularly in growing children.

better balanced rations, but mainly to increased consumption of milk. In the thirteen age-group the boys increased by three-quarters of an inch in height and no less than three pounds in weight, whereas the girls increased by 0.72 inch in height and rather more than the boys in weight. These figures are quoted by way of evidence that increased consumption of milk in the case of young children materially improves their stature and their weight.

It has been conclusively proved by systematic observation that milk consumption is in almost direct ratio with income. Consumption rises steeply as we pass from the poorest social grade to the skilled artisan class, and still rises, but more slowly, as we pass to the wealthier classes. The effect of income on the consumption of condensed milk is exactly the reverse of that for fresh milk. The consumption of butter follows a similar course to that for fresh milk, while that for margarine shows a slight fall with increasing income. The consumption of cheese rises slightly with income. If the consumption of milk is to rise from its present level of 0.65 pint daily to the desired level advocated by the medical profession, viz. an average per head of one pint daily, the public must be assured that the milk is both clean and disease-free. At present, particularly under the system of bulk collection from various farms, there is a considerable chance of milk from one unsatisfactory farm infecting a much larger bulk of milk with germs of bovine origin, pathogenic to man. The commonest sources of such infection are the germs of bovine tuberculosis, of contagious bovine abortion, and of certain forms of mastitis or inflammation of the udder. Unfortunately at present the incidence of each of these diseases is very high in our herds, and it will be impossible for some time to come (whatever remedial measures are adopted) to prevent the access of these germs to bulked milk. Such milk can, however, be rendered safe by pasteurisation before its distribution to the consumer.

The consumer must not only be protected from pathogenic organisms of bovine origin but also from harmful germs of human or rodent origin which may gain access to the milk, on the farm, in the factory, at the shop or in transit. Pasteurisation, or the raising of the

temperature of the milk to not less than 145° and not more than 150° F., for a period of at least thirty minutes, followed by its immediate cooling to a temperature not exceeding 55°, provided it is efficiently conducted, effectually kills all pathogenic organisms which have gained access to the milk prior thereto, but it is still possible for harmful bacteria to enter the milk during its handling subsequent to such treatment. If the public are to be assured of a milk free from the germs of scarlet fever, septic sore throat, diphtheria, human tuberculosis, typhoid, para-typhoid, dysentery, and other organisms of the food-poisoning type, rigorous attention must be paid to milk even after its pasteurisation. At present the most satisfactory means of ensuring a perfectly safe milk is to pasteurise *in bottle*. But whether pasteurisation is carried out or not, the main objective must be the production on the farm itself of clean and disease-free milk. Realising that children should have first consideration, Mr Churchill, when Prime Minister, stated, in support of the war-time milk 'drive,' that 'there is no better investment for the nation than to put milk into babies'—a most wise and true pronouncement, if he meant by 'milk' a pure and safe product, free from pathogenic germs of bovine or human origin.

The need for a rapid and substantial increase in the milk output in Great Britain can be met by an increase in the number of our dairy cattle and/or by an increased yield per cow. It is material to ask what are the actual milk needs, both basic and optimum, for the physical well-being of our population and what is the gallonage required to raise the present output up to that figure? There are approximately 3,000,000 dairy cattle in Great Britain with an average annual yield of approximately 500 gallons. The national milk output is therefore about 1,500,000,000 gallons. The pre-war *per capita* consumption of milk was 0.45 pint per day. It is now 0.65, an increase of just over 40 per cent. on a very low datum level.

If we consider consumption levels in other countries, figures published by the League of Nations show that the pre-war liquid milk consumption was highest in Finland. There the average consumption was 2.46 pints a day, five times the *per capita* consumption in this country. Sweden came second with a consumption of 1.41 pints; that of

Denmark was 1.27 pints (which is over three times the *per capita* milk consumption in Great Britain); Norway 1.11 pints; Switzerland 1.06 pints; the United States 1.06 to 1.11 pints; Austria 1 pint (about twice our consumption); Germany 0.72 of a pint; the Netherlands 0.70; Belgium 0.46; and Italy 0.23. Consumption in New Zealand used to be about 0.45, but during the war has increased to 0.66 of a pint. The rate of consumption in Canada was 0.85 and in Australia 0.39 of a pint.

The lowest reasonable target to aim at for milk consumption is 0.75 of a pint a day, children and nursing mothers receiving rather more. But as already indicated the highest expert opinion favours one pint daily. On this basis, and on that of the present allocation of liquid supplies, the national consumption should be over 2,000,000,000 gallons per annum. This would necessitate the production annually of an additional 500 million gallons.

During the period between the two world wars, the progressive dairy farmer has made considerable progress in his methods of management, dairy husbandry, and disease control. This has been done with but little economic stimulus. There still remains, however, much more to be done, particularly in the extension to the average farmer of the improvements effected by the best farmers (often assisted by their landlords) in their buildings and equipment and in the health and productivity of their herds. The price paid to the farmer for pure milk must be such as to call forth his best energies in producing it, while that paid to its retailer must not exceed what the poorest family can afford to pay for an amount deemed adequate for their nutritional needs (allowing for fair, but not excessive, remuneration to the distributor) and the gulf between the two must be bridged, if necessary, by a sufficient Government subsidy.

It has to be admitted, with regret and some measure of national shame, that in the matter of the general milk supply, its quality, individual milk consumption, the milk yield per cow, bovine disease, veterinary supervision, and the number and facilities for training of her veterinarians, Great Britain does not compare favourably with most of the other civilised countries of the world.

As has been indicated previously, if the optimum

requirements of our home population are to be met, 500,000,000 more gallons of milk per annum must be produced, an amount equal to the product of over 1,000,000 additional cows at the present level of yields. The number would be considerably less, if preventable bovine diseases were in fact prevented. The volume of milk sold off farms in England and Wales has increased during the war by approximately 5 per cent., but our present milk production is obtained from 20 per cent. more cows. The actual yield per cow is therefore lower. This, of course, is due to lack of feeding concentrates—imported cattle cake, oil seeds and the like.

It is particularly interesting to note that there is a marked difference in the bovine milk yield and human milk consumption in this country as compared with others. There are available, as regards milk yields, very valuable and admittedly reliable figures furnished by Mr Lamartine Yates, in the excellent publication, 'Food Production in Western Europe,' which was published in 1940. Taking the pre-war average yields in six European countries, the Netherlands (whose standard of husbandry is outstanding and steadily improving) stand first with an average of 770 gallons per cow, that is to say, roughly 50 per cent. more than Great Britain. Furthermore, there are relatively more veterinarians in practice in that country than we have here. It is significant that both the average milk yield and the number of veterinarians per million domesticated animals is 50 per cent. greater in Holland than in this country. Next comes Denmark with an average yield per cow of 700 gallons; then Belgium with 680 gallons; Switzerland with 665 gallons; Germany with 550 gallons; Great Britain with 500 gallons; and, last on the list, France with 400 gallons. France is the only Western European country which has a lower average milk yield per cow than Great Britain. And, incidentally, she has per head of live-stock the second smallest number of veterinarians employed, a number only slightly higher than Great Britain, which comes lowest on the list. This comparison of milk yields and a nation's veterinary personnel is pertinent to an inquiry into the losses arising from animal disease in this country.

The unreliability of the quality of Britain's milk is tacitly admitted by enforced pasteurisation in most of our

larger centres of population, and its inadequate consumption in the homes of our people is similarly admitted by the much-welcomed State provision of milk to school children, infants, and nursing mothers. These, of course, are palliatives. The problem needs to be tackled at its source. The shortage of milk is due, first of all, to the relatively small number of our dairy cattle and their low average milk yield. This low yield is due in part to haphazard methods of breeding and selection of our live-stock, but is mainly attributable to the prevalence of bovine disease. The Ministry of Agriculture has recently adopted a more progressive policy with regard to the licensing of bulls, artificial insemination, milk recording, and other aspects of live-stock improvement. Even so, there would appear to be scope for further progressive measures, including especially insistence upon the provision of an adequate water supply on every dairy farm, both for immediate cooling of the milk in the farm dairy and the efficient cleanliness (and sterilisation where necessary) of cow houses and dairy utensils.

In the Second Report of the Loveday Committee on Veterinary Education, laid before Parliament in April 1944, it is estimated that the losses arising from animal disease are costing the nation at least 30,000,000*l.* a year. The largest proportion of this financial drain is attributable to disease in dairy cattle.

The five chief diseases of dairy cattle are mastitis of various types, contagious abortion, sterility, Johne's disease, and tuberculosis. (Some medical men appear to believe that the ingestion of milk containing bovine tubercular germs by children, although conveying the risk of cervical and abdominal trouble of a bovine character, immunises them against human tuberculosis. No support, however, can be given to such an uncontrolled method of immunisation, even if it were founded upon fact. The great bulk of the medical profession insist that no milk should be consumed which contains germs of bovine tuberculosis.)

In a recent exhaustive survey of the effects of the four diseases, mastitis, contagious abortion, sterility, and Johne's disease, the National Veterinary Medical Association estimated that they are responsible for a reduction in the annual yield of the national herd by some 200,000,000

gallons of milk. These figures are certainly staggering, but they do not include those arising from tuberculosis. The Association confidently affirms that by taking drastic measures to control these diseases, this immense reduction in our potential milk supply could ultimately be avoided, as all the above diseases are, in the opinion of expert veterinarians, preventable. Their prevalence and their steady increase in recent years are due in no small measure to lack of veterinary supervision and control, the relative paucity of veterinary practitioners, their non-employment by many stock-owners, and the need for improved facilities for training and a higher professional status of many who engage in veterinary practice.

Dealing separately with the above diseases it is estimated that 25 to 30 per cent. of Britain's dairy cattle suffer from one or other form of mastitis. Whilst there is no ready cure available for every form of this disease, proper herd management, including rigorous hygienic 'cowshed drill' and the application of appropriate preventive and remedial measures, can considerably reduce the incidence of the disease and lessen the duration of individual attacks. Regular professional supervision of the herd is valuable, as in all cases the earlier that treatment is applied, the more satisfactory is the response. The increasing use of milking machines in the hands of unskilled or careless stockmen is partly responsible for the spread of this disease. Mastitis not only causes a direct loss in the amount of milk, but that which is produced from affected cows is often of lowered nutritional quality.

Contagious abortion, on the other hand, is a disease caused by a specific germ which has infected something like 40 per cent. of the present dairy cattle of this country. It not only induces considerable reduction in the milk yield of the affected cow, but it has a delaying effect on the nation's supply of milk, seeing that the loss of female calves means fewer potential milk producers in the future. This loss is not negligible, for it is generally admitted that about 10 per cent. of all calves are prematurely born, which means a loss of about 150,000 female calves each year. Consumption of milk from affected cattle induces undulant fever in human beings, a malady which appears to be becoming more prevalent in Great Britain. The discovery in recent years of a new and most valuable vaccine

known as S.19, inoculation with which effectually immunises calves and young heifers against contagious abortion, seems likely to stem its spread materially in the future.

Sterility is also widely dispersed throughout the cattle population but it is usually of temporary duration. Nevertheless, it gives rise to considerable loss in milk owing to the fact that dairy cattle, which should be producing one calf a year and thereby maintaining their milk production at a high level over many years, do not produce calves so frequently. Many cows thus affected only produce a calf every eighteen months to two years. Appropriate professional treatment would obviate a large proportion of these losses. Indeed, it is estimated that the annual reduction of milk output due to temporary infertility of dairy cattle is over 100,000,000 gallons. As moreover the loss of potential calves from this cause is put at 80,000 a year, future milk production is likewise diminished thereby.

The deficiency in milk production arising from these four diseases can best be realised by indicating their average effect respectively upon a cow with a normal yield of 500 gallons a year. Such a cow would only give 440 gallons, if affected with mastitis, 385 gallons if suffering from temporary infertility, and from about 200 to 375 gallons if suffering from contagious abortion, the greater reduction arising from the earlier abortion.

Tuberculosis also appreciably affects the milk yield of dairy cattle. Although nearly half the cattle of the country are affected with tuberculosis and react to the tuberculin test, only one-half of one per cent. yield milk containing bovine tubercular germs. No accurate estimate of the loss of milk arising from tuberculosis is available, but the Cattle Diseases Committee, which was set up by the Government under the Chairmanship of Sir Frederick Gowland Hopkins, F.R.S., reporting in 1934, reckoned the financial loss to farmers to be at least 3,000,000*l.* per annum. Although the incidence of tuberculosis in cattle over the whole country is in the neighbourhood of 40 per cent., it varies considerably from one locality to another. In some areas, such as Carnarvonshire and Ayrshire, a very high proportion of the dairy cattle are in attested herds, i.e. herds entirely free from bovine

tuberculosis. In other areas, however, particularly where the herds are 'flying herds,' the incidence is nearer 90 per cent. This indicates the correct method of controlling this disease—viz. on an area basis, gradually extending the areas of freedom to the whole country.

Various other morbid conditions, such as result from parasitic gastro-enteritis and the warble-fly, also cause indirect loss in the milk of affected cattle. No accurate estimate of the magnitude of this loss is available, but it is by no means negligible. It can generally be avoided by simple remedial measures.

It must regretfully be confessed that not merely in our numerous live-stock markets but even in the show-yards of our great Agricultural Societies the unrestricted presence of animals affected with these diseases, especially tuberculosis and contagious abortion, has been a means of spreading them, by contact, both to sound animals in Great Britain and also possibly, on export, to those abroad. In view of the unrivalled fame of British pedigree live-stock throughout the world this risk is greatly to be deprecated. It is pleasant to be able to record that the Royal Agricultural Society of England has recently decided that henceforth no cattle shall be admitted to its showyard, unless they come from 'attested' herds or have passed the tuberculin test within a reasonable time before the show. A similar regulation is contemplated in due course regarding contagious abortion, when the requisite vaccine becomes more readily available and its efficacy is more fully recognised. This enlightened lead by England's premier Agricultural Society seems likely to be followed by all the other chief show-holding societies in Britain.

As it cannot be denied that the effect of cattle disease upon milk production is serious, the problem of disease control must be tackled by the Government with greater energy than has been displayed in the past. It must be realised, however, that the Veterinary Service of the Ministry of Agriculture deserves high commendation for the efficiency of its work in keeping the country so remarkably free from notifiable contagious diseases, such as have devastating effects in many other parts of the world. Were it not for our entire freedom from cattle plague and bovine pleuro-pneumonia and our comparatively rare out-

breaks of foot-and-mouth disease, the milk situation in this relatively crowded country would be far more serious than it is; indeed intensive dairy farming would be almost impossible. In 1938 the Diseases of Animals Division of the Ministry of Agriculture was renamed the Animal Health Division. It was anticipated as a result that vigorous measures to attack the more common animal diseases would be undertaken, and members of the veterinary profession would have welcomed them. Little, however, has yet been done. The old gentle method of attack upon tuberculosis by confining slaughter to advanced cases only (under the provisions of the Tuberculosis Order) and merely encouraging farmers of their own volition to free their herds from this disease by applying the tuberculin test (which has been practised for half a century), still continues, and has scarcely affected the general incidence of tuberculosis in British herds. Even now the number of so-called 'attested herds' in Great Britain was on January 31 last only 17,185 out of a total of over 150,000. The time is overdue for the initiation of a full-scale attack upon this unnecessarily prevalent disease. In the United States of America tuberculosis has been eliminated from dairy cattle through the energetic prosecution of a nation-wide scheme, based upon tuberculin testing and the slaughter of all reactors, with accompanying payment of compensation to their owners. It is appreciated that the initial incidence of the disease in that country was only about 5 per cent. and that therefore the same drastic process of eradication is not yet practicable here. It would, indeed, be a serious matter, particularly for our young people, if, as in the United States, all our cattle reacting to the tuberculin test were slaughtered, bearing in mind what a very large proportion of our milk supply comes from these reactors. It is, however, the confident belief of our most authoritative veterinarians that Britain could embark upon a scheme of area eradication, based upon compulsory tuberculin testing, and removal of reactors, with control of breeding, of new purchases, and of marketing, in these areas, which could then be gradually extended to embrace eventually the whole country.

Although the British Government has hitherto done comparatively little towards the eradication of tuber-

culosis, it has done even less to deal effectively with the other specified diseases. For many years it has been illegal to expose a cow in a market within two months of her abortion, but this enactment has been largely ignored. Now, it is true, the Ministry of Agriculture undertakes the vaccination of calves against contagious abortion at the low cost to their owners of one shilling per head, but this forms no part of a coordinated attack upon the disease. Indeed, in some ways it cuts across the more comprehensive scheme arranged between the National Veterinary Medical Association and the National Farmers' Union for the control of contagious abortion, mastitis, sterility, and Johne's disease, which has been in operation since June 1, 1942. This scheme takes the form of a voluntary contract between farmer and veterinary practitioner, whereby for an annual fee of about ten shillings per cow the practitioner undertakes to help with the control of these diseases and for this purpose to visit the farm premises and examine the herd at least once every three months. Although the scheme has official endorsement, in that certain vaccines and other helpful facilities are provided by the Government, it does not yet include more than 7,275 herds, comprising 191,373 cows and 194,826 heifers. This represents only about 10 per cent. of the total dairy cattle of Great Britain. Nevertheless, the scheme has indicated clearly that considerable control of these diseases can be achieved by these regular quarterly visits, during which the management of the herd, both as regards general fitness and disease control, is reviewed by the practitioner in consultation with the farmer. The Veterinary Officers of the Ministry of Agriculture might with advantage participate in this scheme, first by helping to correlate the results obtained in the different herds, and secondly by making more readily available to the practitioners the assistance of specialists in certain branches of the work involved. The paramount nutritional importance of milk to the nation would fully justify the development by the Ministry of such supervisory and specialist services. Indeed, the present voluntary scheme might with advantage be replaced by one which is State-assisted, and covers all diseases of dairy cattle which are likely seriously to reduce milk production.

Of no small importance to the solution of this serious

problem of cattle diseases is the execution of a proper survey of their incidence throughout the country. In this connection it is eminently desirable to utilise information gained in abattoirs and slaughter-houses and follow it back to the farm. At present there is no State Abattoir Service under veterinary supervision similar to that which exists in most other progressive countries. Steps should be taken without delay to bring the production and control of meat under the direct supervision of the Animal Health Division of the Ministry of Agriculture. The importance of this development lies not only in securing for the consumer a more efficient meat inspection service, but also in facilitating the early diagnosis of disease and its correlation with the character and extent of disease in the area from which live-stock intended for slaughter come. In reality the abattoir, provided that it is worked in conjunction with the farm, is a most valuable factor in any comprehensive scheme for the improvement of animal health and of milk and meat supplies.

Summarising the position, the gravity of which cannot be gainsaid, the nation needs for its physical well-being much more milk, which must come from disease-free cattle of higher yield than the present average, and this in turn depends upon their good management, wholesome environment, and an efficient and sufficient veterinary service. There are many who contend that no marked improvement can be looked for at present, owing to the serious shortage of veterinary surgeons. While it must be admitted that such a shortage does exist, this cannot be accepted as a pretext for taking little constructive action. A more vigorous reorganisation of animal health measures in this country, accompanied by more active cooperation between practitioners and whole-time veterinary officers along the lines suggested, is badly needed, and, while taking due account of the shortage of personnel, should be put in hand without delay.

The problem of improving the facilities for veterinary education and research and for increasing appreciably the number of trained veterinary surgeons should be treated as one of urgency, and the Government should make it clear that it is prepared without further delay to implement the recommendations of the Loveday Report which was laid before Parliament in April 1944. The capital

outlay of 2,000,000*l.* and annual subsidy of 210,000*l.* recommended in the Report involve but a trifling charge upon the Exchequer, and should be voted forthwith and prove a remunerative national investment. The recommendation of the Loveday Committee that veterinary education should fall within the wider scope of University education is challenged in some quarters, but it has the backing of the most authoritative section of the veterinary profession.

Not only should veterinary education and research be improved, but the conditions of service of veterinary officers serving in the Ministry of Agriculture call for drastic amelioration. They should be brought into line with those available to members of the sister profession of medicine. It should be remembered that the veterinary profession provides the most intimate advisory service of our greatest national industry, and its status should be comparable with the high value of its work.

It is no less necessary to stress the desirability for the farmer and those whom he employs in handling his cows and his milk, to receive some technical training designed to give them a more adequate appreciation of the scientific basis for the hygienic measures which are so strongly advocated by their professional advisers. The known fact of such training would incidentally enhance the confidence of milk consumers in the towns.

The victorious termination of the war finds the nutrition campaign in full swing, with milk in the forefront of all protective human foods. Many medical, veterinary, and agricultural authorities have helped forward this all important nutrition campaign, but none has done more valuable service to the cause than Sir John Boyd Orr, F.R.S., now M.P. for the Scottish Universities.

BLEDISLOE.

W. R. WOOLDRIDGE.

SOME RECENT BOOKS.

Government Control in War. Lord Hankey, G.C.B., G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O.

British Architects and Craftsmen. Sacheverell Sitwell.

The Houses of Parliament. Hans Wild and James Pope-Hennessy.

English Church Design, 1040 to 1540 A.D. F. H. Crossley.

Law and Orders. Carleton Kemp Allen, M.C., K.C., D.C.L.

Wilberforce. Sir Reginald Coupland, K.C.M.G., C.I.E.

Science and the Planned State. John R. Baker, D.Phil., D.Sc.

Counties of Contention. Benedict Kiely.

Byron's Don Juan. Elizabeth French Boyd.

Eastern Europe Between the Wars, 1918-1941. Hugh Seton-Watson.

Norman O'Neill. Derek Hudson.

Dr Trevelyan in his preface (written at the author's special request) to Lord Hankey's '**Government Control in War**' (Cambridge University Press) says that no introduction by anyone is required for a work by Lord Hankey 'on his own subject, because for nearly forty years he has taken a leading part in the rapid development of the various organs of our modern Government Control in War, and knows better than anyone the inside working of the machinery of War Cabinets, Imperial Conferences, and Service Committees which has been created with such success to win both the last and the present war.' This is indeed true, and Lord Hankey's vast experience from the first establishment of the Committee of Imperial Defence onwards has gone to the writing of this most interesting little book. The main conclusion reached is that control in war must remain in the hands of statesmen. In the grand strategy the views of the Service Chiefs must usually prevail, but even here the last word must remain with the statesmen who are responsible for policy and for distributing the resources of the country in the manner best calculated to win the war. The developments of the organisation are carefully traced through the years—that is not what was wanting in 1914 and 1939 but the men and machines to get it working properly. 'There is no question that in 1939 the administrative preparations were as complete as they could be within the limits of our policy and the finances made available.' There lies the key of the whole matter and what Lord Hankey writes is convincing and extremely instructive.

A notable addition to Messrs Batsford's deservedly

famous series of books on art, architecture, and the countryside is Mr Sacheverell Sitwell's '**British Architects and Craftsmen.**' It combines wide experience and expert knowledge and discerning judgment with dignity and clarity of style, and is served up so to speak in a most welcome way with the *sauce piquante* of the Author's personal tastes and opinions. The subtitle is 'A Survey of Taste, Design, and Style during Three Centuries, 1600-1830,' and its promise is well fulfilled. It is satisfying fare that we are given: Elizabethan and Jacobean building; Inigo Jones; Sir Christopher Wren; Sir John Vanbrugh; Hawksmoor and the Baroque; Gibbs and the Rococo; Kent and the Palladians; the Adams and their rivals or successors, and the Regency period. Special attention is paid to the craftsmen, furniture, clock, and tapestry makers, silversmiths, bookbinders, decorators, and painters, and all that gave the eighteenth century its particular grace and distinction. We might wish perhaps for the sake of less erudite readers that Mr Sitwell had defined more exactly his meaning of Baroque and Rococo and their limits, for much rather tantalisingly varied work is included under those terms. Among minor points, considering how carefully the Author deals with Hawksmoor, we should like to know more of his opinions on Hawksmoor's Gothic work at Westminster and elsewhere. But these are but small criticisms in the case of so interesting, informative, and delightful a work. Two hundred well-chosen and excellently produced illustrations adorn the book, and we welcome the well-deserved dedication 'To Mr Harry Batsford whose life has been devoted to preserving and making popular the buildings and craftsmanship of England.' Ireland also has an honourable share of this book, and we could wish that Scotland had an equal one.

Another most attractive Batsford book is '**The Houses of Parliament,**' photographed by Hans Wild, with an introduction by James Pope-Hennessy—though indeed 'introduction' is an understatement for it is a scholarly and comprehensive treatise on the Palace of Westminster with a useful description of what it was before the fire of 1834, how it was rebuilt and decorated by Barry and Pugin, and how it has suffered in the present war. In addition we are told much of the pageantry, customs,

and traditions of Parliament, and Mr Pope-Hennessy escorts us round the buildings, pointing out the architectural features, the lavish decoration, the Gothic luxuriance and gilded magnificence of the various chambers and halls, with a zest that is as informative as it is attractive. The photographs are altogether excellent and show the taste of the artist blended with exact detail of the recorder. No notice of this book would be complete without a reference to the altogether delightful, though puzzling, wrapper taken from an early Victorian lithograph and showing the whole range of the Palace and the Lambeth gateway, but in reverse, which has a curious effect. Looked at in a mirror the picture resumes its rightful arrangement and leaves the reader asking why this reversal was made.

There is still another Batsford book which deserves a warm welcome. Mr F. H. Crossley is a well-known and highly experienced writer on English mediæval architecture and thus well qualified to deal with its revaluation, which he considers overdue. His views on Victorian restoration are not unknown and are certainly not modified in his new book '**English Church Design, 1040 to 1540 A.D.**' 'In the study of our period we are placed at some disadvantage, for the output of four centuries suffered first severe destruction, followed by a period of neglect, and finally by drastic "restoration," not repair, so much so indeed that but few buildings remaining can be considered mediæval or genuine,' and again, 'At the present day this Victorian bastard "Gothic" is completely in disrepute; it has unhappily effectually destroyed any taste for the real thing.' This we hope is a considerable overstatement, and it must be remembered that but for Victorian restoration, mistaken in effect though it often was, many fine old churches would have been in ruins long before this. When he has dealt faithfully with the Victorians, Mr Crossley settles down to give his readers much excellent fare in the way of useful and enlightening information about towers, façades, external and internal architectural detail, lay-outs and plans of churches, and the organisation of mediæval building. His knowledge of English churches is comprehensive and all embracing, and there is no point apparently which he cannot illustrate from personal visitations of the buildings. The illustra-

tions are excellent and the Batsford wrapper as usual charming.

Dr Carleton Kemp Allen in his latest book '**Law and Orders**' (Stevens & Sons), aims at examining the powers vested at the present day in Parliament, the Government Departments, and the Courts, and treating this most important subject in a way that is both useful to the lawyer and easily intelligible by the layman. It must be admitted that the book does at times make stiff reading for the layman, but his perseverance will be well rewarded. Beginning with an account of the balance of powers of the Government, executive, legislative, and judicial, Dr Allen goes on to show how delegation of powers has grown, is growing, and is likely to grow more, including references to the notorious D.O.R.A. We are then shown the powers that be, legislative and judicial, and the relations of Parliament and the Executive, also of the Judiciary and the Public with the Executive. We are shown how the exigencies of war necessitate emergency powers and countless regulations and multiplication of petty offences, and the dangers which are inherent in the process and which give a warning for the future. The Author adds, 'In the present phase of the Constitution the centre of gravity has shifted to the Executive and the role of Parliament in government has proportionately diminished. Has British democracy been able to defend itself without sacrificing its fundamental rights?' That, surely, would be too large a claim; the sacrifice has been made. 'Is that sacrifice only temporary and will it be terminated as soon as peace provides the opportunity. It is for the public to demand fulfilment of that assurance from all who by its own choosing are set in authority over it.' That is the key to the value of the book, and it is of very real value for all who are ready to concentrate in serious study.

A new edition of Sir Reginald Coupland's outstanding biography '**Wilberforce**' (Collins), first published in 1923, is very welcome. The name of William Wilberforce is inseparably associated with the twenty-year hard, exhausting, often disappointing and finally triumphant struggle for the suppression of the Slave Trade, in which struggle he played the leading part; and with the subsequent struggle for the abolition of Slavery, in which owing

to increasing years and ill-health he had to surrender the leadership to Thomas Fowell Buxton.

It is curious now to read of the young Wilberforce, afterwards so devout and earnest, and the young Pitt, so soon aged beyond his years and overburdened by the cares of office, positively rollicking together. Then came Wilberforce's 'conversion' and realisation of the compelling power of true religion which became his guide in all his public and private life, and singularly beautiful that life was in its unselfishness, purity, and devotion to humanity. Some have accused him of being a prig, a very usual charge against saintliness but one which the Author convincingly disproves. In these days, when we hear so much of the appalling cruelty of German concentration camps, it is perhaps sobering to our rooted conviction that we could never be guilty of such horrors to be shown that right into the nineteenth century bestialities, which even Germans could not exceed, were being committed daily in slave ships flying the British flag. But by the mercy of Providence we have travelled far since those days when even honest and honourable men could and did support the Slave Trade. Sir Reginald Coupland with the skill of a trained historian gives an absorbing picture of Wilberforce and his times.

Dr John R. Baker's book '**Science and the Planned State**' (Allen and Unwin) is a convincing and authoritative plea for freedom in scientific study. He deals with the values of science, material and immaterial, and its appreciation as an end in itself and not merely as a means to technology. He shows that imposed team work by no means gets the best results and many of the finest discoveries come from solitary researches. Then we are shown the dangers to science of totalitarianism, especially as displayed in Russia, and the picture given of scientific work there will come as rather a shock to Russia-worshippers here. Finally, in some interesting chapters Dr Baker deals with the duties of scientists to society, including the unwanted intervention of politics. The purpose of this valuable and thought-provoking book may be summed up in the Author's words, 'Some of our younger scientists, affected by propaganda, are ready to let central planning and a crudely materialistic outlook supplant the freedom and idealism that have made science

great. Our scientific heritage is threatened. Science is not our private fortune to squander as we will. It is a heritage that is entailed to future generations and we should preserve it and add to it.'

Students of Irish problems should read '**Counties of Contention**,' by Benedict Kiely (Mercier Press). It does not claim to be an impartial and judicial summing up of both sides of the Partition question, but it is an earnest and eloquent pleading of the Nationalist case. After a somewhat unnecessarily long discussion of the rights and wrongs of using the convenient but obviously not very accurate term of Ulster for six counties only, Mr Kiely proceeds to give a survey of the historical events leading up to the Partition, of its actual coming into force, and of its subsequent working. All reasonable people admit that the boundary line is a physical and geographical anomaly which should be remedied, but Mr Kiely cannot convince us that it is not a political necessity under present conditions. He derides the fears of the Six County Ulsterman about coming under the sway of Dublin, but he gives little space to the atrocities committed against and the injustice too often shown to Loyalists in Southern Ireland. He gives full consideration to the often most regrettable actions of the Orangemen, but it is not without cause that Orangemen have become what they have become. The most astonishing feature of Mr Kiely's book is the almost total omission of reference to Mr de Valera; and yet it is Eamon de Valera and his actions, speeches, and conduct during the war which make any thought of ending the Partition at present impossible. No Ulster Loyalist could be expected to face the conditions which Mr de Valera exacts.

Surely few English poets have had so much written about them as Byron. Hardly a year passes, even in war-time, without a new volume, often, it must be admitted, in the past dealing more with the more lurid portions of his career and his domestic misfortunes. Miss Elizabeth French Boyd's '**Byron's Don Juan**' (Rutgers University Press, U.S.A.) is an excellent example of a serious, well-balanced, and well connoted critical study of poetical work with an account of the background, character, and tastes of the poet. We are shown that 'Byron's Juan is neither a diabolical monster nor a Faustian superman, nor

even a blithe rascal like the conventional *picaro*. He is an ordinary human boy whose adventures, though spectacular and bloody, are thoroughly mundane.' 'In Don Juan Byron fused double purposes and double models to produce a peculiarly Byronic medley. Jest and earnest, epic and satire, are almost indissolubly mixed together.' The general theme may be taken as Nature *v.* Civilisation, and is illustrated not only in the hero's love affairs but also in his travels. The poem is a compound of self-expression and literary reminiscence, and purely autobiographical elements are blended with echoes of the literature in which Byron had saturated himself. This leads the Author to include a most interesting chapter on Byron's reading and book collecting, a side of his life which has too often been overlooked. There is also a most careful study of his character. 'He is a sceptic who would like to persuade himself that he is perfectly poised in his scepticism, but who is really so uncomfortable in it that he is constantly launching out on a new, though hopeless, struggle towards belief. He longs to believe yet shrinks from believing because he thinks himself incurably solitary and independent.' Miss Boyd is to be congratulated on a work of great interest to all Byronians.

Following the example of his distinguished father, Mr Hugh Seton-Watson is making himself an authority on one of the most involved and vexing problems of the day. In '**Eastern Europe Between the Wars, 1918-1941**' (Cambridge University Press), he has studied and, on the whole, clearly presented a picture of the region between Germany and Russia inhabited by some hundred million people. It would seem that democracies never realise the danger of fire until the house is ablaze! Over eighty years ago Lord Acton warned Europe of the dangers of Nationalism. In this immensely difficult area the inhabitants are deeply divided by ignorance, poverty, overpopulation, extreme nationalism, and separatist and chauvinist ambitions. The late General Sikorski warmly advocated a federation of the free nations of Central and Eastern Europe under the leadership of Poland and Czechoslovakia. But are the majority of these little nations any longer free to make a choice? By hurriedly setting up puppet Governments formed in Moscow in both the large countries and the small has not Russia already

decided the issue—at any rate for a long time to come? If this solution were definitely confined to the Slav States there might be something to be said for it, but no one can pretend that Hungary and Rumania should be included. Mr Seton-Watson rightly stresses the enormous economic needs of the whole area. Perhaps the most hopeless aspect of these involved questions is that they provide so many ready-made party-cries for both internal and external consumption. 'Break up the large estates' is a favourite slogan yet, as the author very fairly points out, this generally means exchanging good management by one authority for bad management by thousands of small owners who have neither the education, nor capital, nor machinery to keep their land in good heart. Here, as so often elsewhere, the cure is far worse than the disease.

Mr Seton-Watson adumbrates no easy solutions, but in this careful, thorough, well-documented volume he has fairly set forth all the relevant factors. The obvious truth that he has close personal knowledge of all the countries concerned, and a sincere admiration for the many fine qualities of their varied peoples, gives his study a human warmth that greatly adds to its effectiveness.

Derek Hudson's biography of his father-in-law, 'Norman O'Neill' (Quality Press), is an interesting record of a full and active life devoted to music and musicians. It is as composer for the theatre that O'Neill is best known, but he was a fine and hard-working musician of many parts, conductor and pianist, director and teacher. The sense of proportion, balance, and charm which he brought into his music also filled his whole life. He was that rare combination, an artist of integrity who was also a practical businessman, and this was of immense help to him in his work for the theatre. When he was little more than a student he married Adine Ruckert, herself a talented pianist and teacher, and his private life was as full and happy as his public one. A less evenly successful career would perhaps have made a more stirring book to read, but this is a faithful account of a man who did much to raise the whole tone of theatrical music in his generation and who influenced public taste accordingly.

**POSTSCRIPT TO REORGANISATION OF THE FOREIGN
SERVICE (page 412)**

Since my article on this subject was completed, the debate on the Address in the new Parliament has proved that Mr Bevin and Mr Eden are, like Lord Rosebery and Lord Salisbury in former days, ready to carry on foreign policy from the point where the other left it, with a change of emphasis, perhaps, but without dislocation. A resolute lead by the Foreign Secretary better avails to ensure continuity than any new machinery. Mr Bevin moreover has already shown that he means the Foreign Office and not 10 Downing Street to be the focusing point of foreign policy. He is also fully alive to the importance of economics. Thus tendencies already noted and described in my article seem likely to be accelerated and consolidated by the new Foreign Secretary.

A. L. K.

INDEX

TO THE

TWO HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-THIRD VOLUME OF THE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

[Titles of Articles are printed in heavier type. The names of authors of articles are printed in italics.]

A.

Abbot, Professor C. C., 457.
Acland, Sir Richard, notes 448-449.
Acres, W. Marston, 'The Bank of England from Within,' 28, 30.
Acton, 1st Baron, 206, 217-218.
Æschylus, 177.
'A Fifth Freedom,' 308, 315-317, 319-321.
Alba, Duke of, 142.
Alfonso XIII, King, 139, 148-149.
Allen, Dr Carleton Kemp, 'Law and Orders,' 499.
Allenby, Viscount, 393.
Althorp, Esther, Viscountess, 474.
Althorp, John, see Spencer, Earl.
Amery, Rt Hon. L. S., 60, 66, 69-70, 407.
Appleton, G., 'Buddhism in Burma,' 430.
Archer, William, 179-181.
Aristophanes, 177.
Arnold, Matthew, 321.
Arrese, Señor, 142.
Asensio, General, 143.
'Asiatic Review, The,' 57.
Attlee, Rt Hon. C. R., 260, 403.
Australia, The Church and, 335-348.
Aykroyd, Dr, 69.
Azana, Señor, 147.

B.

Bagehot, Walter, 'Lombard Street,' 29-30.
Baker, Dr John R., 'Science and the Planned State,' 500-501.
Baldwin, Earl, 255, 403.
Balfour, 1st Earl of, 98.

Balsowsky, Bishop, 21.
Bank of England and Bretton Woods, The, 28-43.
Banks, Sir Joseph, 335, 337.
Barker, Granville H., 183-184.
Barry, Bishop, 340, 345.
Barton, Sir William, 'India's Fateful Hour,' 57—'The Indian Peasant, The Peasant Soldier and Economic Planning,' 165.
Batt, William, 239.
Beaconsfield, Earl of, 258, note 398.
Beaverbrook, Lord, 107-108.
Benn, Sir Ernest, Bt, 'The Death-Bed of the Nation?' 129.
Bertie, 1st Viscount, 399.
Bessborough, The Earl of, 'An Early Victorian Diary,' 44.
Bessborough, 7th Earl of, 51-52.
Bessborough, Harriet, Countess of, 44.
Beveridge, Sir William, 112, 132, 134-135, 452—'Full Employment in a Free Society,' 242-243.
Bevin, Rt Hon. Ernest, 134, 364, 402-403, 412, 504.
Birkenhead, 1st Earl of, 221.
Biron, Sir Chartres, 'Without Prejudice,' 82.
Bledisloe, The Viscount, 'Pure Milk,' 480.
'Blue Print for Burma,' 431, 434, 438.
Bonham-Carter, Lady Violet, 240.
Books, Some Recent, 121-128, 242-251, 369-376, 496-503.
Boswell, James, 456-467.
Bourdillon, Sir Bernard, 320.
Boyd, Elizabeth French, 'Byron's Don Juan,' 501-502.
Brabazon, Lord, 108.
Bracken, Rt Hon. Brendan, 364.

Bretton Woods Conference, 36-38, 131.

Britain and the Peace: The Search for Security, 253-268.

Britain at War, 104-120, 228-241, 251, 361-369.

Broughton, Bishop, 337-338.

Bryce, Viscount, 223, 399.

Bülów, Prince von, 99, 217.

Burgess, Perry, 'Who Walk Alone,' 308, 318-319.

Burma, 430-444.

'Burma Statement of Policy,' 431.

Butler, Rt Hon. R. A., 114-115, 235, 295.

Butler, Samuel, 'Erehwon,' 455.

C.

Cadogan, Hon. Sir Alexander, 260, 402.

Callender, Harold, 'A Preface to Peace,' 244-245.

Canterbury, Dr Fisher, Archbishop of, 201, 234.

Casado, Colonel, 144, 146.

Casey, Rt Hon. R. G., 61, 70-71, 405.

Castlereagh, Viscount, 254.

Castlereagh, The Viscount, 'A New Deal for Coal,' 413.

Catroux, General, 395.

Cecil, Algernon, 292—'A House in Bryanston Square,' 370-371.

Cecil, Viscount, 263.

Chamberlain, Sir Austen, 260.

Chatterjee, Sir Atul Chandra, joint author of 'A Short History of India,' 247.

Chatterton, Bishop Eyre, 57.

Christian Attitude to the War and the Peace, The, 16-28.

Christian Contribution to Social Order, The, 421-430.

Church and Australia, The, 335-348.

Churchill, Rt Hon. Winston, 3, 105, 117-118, 120, 139-140, 234, 263, 286, 366, 393, 396, note 398, 402-403, 485.

Cinema: Art or Industry? 321-334.

Clapham, Sir John, 'The Bank of England: A History,' 28-30, 32-33, 35, 43.

Clarendon, 1st Earl of, 101.

Clayton, Bertram, 'Cinema: Art or Industry?' 321.

Clayton, Rev. P. B., 315-316.

Clemenceau, Georges, note 398.

Clinton, Frances, Lady, 475.

Coal, A New Deal for, 413-421.

Cocks, S., M.P., 197.

Cohn, Dr E. J., 80.

Coleridge, 1st Baron, 74.

Coupland, Sir Reginald, 'The Future of India,' 57—'Wilberforce,' 499-500.

Cowley, 1st Earl of, 282.

Craig, Edith, 183.

Cranborne, Viscount, 3, 97, 103-104, 405-407.

Creighton, Bishop, 203.

Cripps, Sir Stafford, 402, 454.

Crossley, F. H., 'English Church Design, 1040-1540, A.D.' 498-499.

Crowe, Sir Eyre, 292, 401.

Curzon, Marquess, 102-103.

Cushing, Helen Grant, joint editor of 'Nineteenth Century Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, 1890-1899, with Supplementary Indexing 1900-1922,' 126-127.

D.

Dallal, Sir Ardesir, 69, 170, 172.

Dalton, Rt Hon. Hugh, 331.

Darnand, Joseph, 11.

Dautry, Raoul, 387-388.

Davies, Daniel, 'Why Not Nationalise the Mines?' 187-201.

Davies, Joseph, 'Mission to Moscow,' 447.

Death-Bed of the Nation? The, 129-138.

Deissmann, Professor Adolf, 26-27.

Dewey, Thomas, 117.

Dick, Sir Alexander, 461-463.

Dickens, Charles, 203.

Dorman-Smith, Sir Reginald, 433.

Drinkwater, John, 184.

Dugdale, Blanche, E. C., 'From Haman to Hitler,' 268.

Duhamel, Georges, 386.

Dumas, Alexandre, père, 179.

Dumas, Alexandre, fils, 179.

Dumbarton Oaks, Conference of, 7-8, 131, 227, 260, 263, 266.

E.

- Early Victorian Diary, An**, 44-56.
Eden, Rt Hon. Anthony, 254, 294, 400, 402-403, 412, 504.
Edlin, H. L., 'British Woodland Trees,' 125-126.
Edward VII, King, 97-102, 392.
Edwards, Ness, M.P., 196.
Eisenhower, General, 229.
Elibank, Viscount, 65.
Ellis, Dr Havelock, 230, 240.
Emmet, Dorothy M., 'The Nature of Metaphysical Thinking,' 376, 369.
Ermeland, Bishop of, 21.
Ervine, St John, 184.
Evans, Major Frederic, 'Thoughts on the Education Act,' 295.

F.

- Falls, Captain Cyril**, 230-231.
Fergusson, Col. Bernard, 'Beyond the Chindwin,' 431-432.
Finlay, Viscount, 71, 78-81.
Fischer, Dr Eric, 'The Passing of the European Age,' 124-125.
Fisher, H. A. L., 235.
Fisher, Louis, 'Men and Politics,' 144.
Flandin, P. E., 11-12.
Foch, Marshal, 1, 3.
Foot, Robert, 187-188, 238-239, 366, 418-419.
Forbes, Sir William, 457.
Forbes-Robertson, Sir Johnston, 184.
Fox, C. J., 397, 473.
France of To-morrow, 1-16.
Franco, General, 140-143, 146-147, 149, 151.
Freiburg, Archbishop of, 21.
Fritsche, Hans, 231.
From Haman to Hitler, 268-281.
Furnivall, J. S., 'The Tropical Far East,' 431, 442.

G.

- Galsworthy, John**, 184.
Gandhi, Mahatma, 62, 64-67, 165-167.
Gardner, Sir Charles Bruce, 106.

- Gaulle, General de**, 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 15, 389-392, 395.
Gay, John, 'Beggars Opera,' 467.
George VI, King, 267.
Gerard, J. W., U.S. Ambassador, 219.
Gilbert, E. W., 161-162.
Gladstone, Rt Hon. W. E., 203, 336, note 398.
Gloucester, Rt Rev. Bishop of, 'The Christian Attitude to the War and the Peace,' 16.
Godwin, George, 'Queen Mary College,' 126.
Goebbels, Dr, 136, 362.
Golder, Stuart, 64, 66.
Goldsmith, Oliver, 179.
Goodhart, Professor A. L., 'International Law and the Causes of War,' 224.
Gordon, Douglas, 'Habit and Idiosyncrasy in Nest Building,' 349.
Gordon, George, 'Shakespearean Comedy,' 249-251.
Gorell, Lord, 'Britain at War,' 104, 228, 361-'Warriors Way,' 378-374.
Gourlay, F. P., M.P., 192.
Gray, W. Forbes, 'James Boswell in the Newer Light,' 456.
Greenwood, Rt Hon. A., 134-135.
Grein, J. T., 'The World of the Theatre,' 176, 181-183.
Grenfell, R. D., M.P., 199.
Greville, Charles, 468.
Grey, Charles, Earl, 476-478.
Grey, Viscount, 97-98, 100-101.
Griffiths, James, M.P., 195-196, 199, 420.
Grigg, Sir Edward, 'British Foreign Policy,' 248-249.
Grigg, Sir James, 119.
Gromyko, A. A., 260.
Grotius, Hugo, 215-216.
Guest, Lady Charlotte, 44-56.
Guest, Sir Josiah, 44, 46, 49-55.
Guest, Montague, 56.

H.

- Habit and Idiosyncrasy in Nest Building**, 349-361.
Halifax, Earl of, 320, 399.
Hall, Rt Hon. G. H., 192.

Hall, W. E., 'International Law,' 216-217.

Halley, David, 'With Wingate in Burma,' 431.

Hankey, Lord, 404, 411—'Government Control in War,' 496.

'Hansard,' 57.

Hardinge of Penshurst, 1st Lord, 97-104, 401.

Harris, Squadron-Leader Murray, 'The Logic of War,' 123-124.

Hart, Sir Robert, 262.

Hart-Synnot, Ronald, 'Some Problems of Post-War Organisation: A Biological Approach,' 152.

Harvey, John H., 'Henry Yevele,' 144.

Hastings, Major Lewis, 231.

Hauriou, Professor André, 11.

Hayek, Professor, 'The Road to Serfdom,' 132.

Herriot, Edouard, note 392.

Herzler, Dr J. O., 271, and note 275.

Hetherington, John, 'Airborne Invasion,' 127.

Hicks, George, M.P., 109-110.

Hicks Beach, 'Mrs. Amabel and Mary Verena,' 247-248.

Hill, Professor A. V., 69-70.

Himmler, H., 106, 362.

Hitler, Adolf, 20-22, 25, 106, 117, 132, 154, 219, 229, 231, 240, 268-269, 274, 279, 286-288, 290, 294, 362-363, 409.

Hole, Christina, 'Witchcraft in England,' 374.

Horniman, Miss, 183-184.

Hot Springs, Conference of, 131, 480.

Hudson, Derek, 'Norman O'Neill,' 503.

Hume, David, 464.

Husain, King of the Hedjaz, 393-394.

Hutchins, Mr and Mrs Edward, 52-53.

I.

Ibsen, H., 180-181.

India in 1944, 57-71.

Indian Peasant, the Peasant Soldier and Economic Planning, The, 165-176.

In France To-day, 377-397.

Inge, Dean, 234-235, 237.

J.

Jackson, Sir Barry, 184.

James Boswell in the Newer Light, 456-467.

James, Henry, 327.

Jeanneney, Jules, 5.

Jenkins, W., M.P., 196-197.

Jinnah, Mr, 63, 65-67.

John Charles, Viscount Althorp, Third Earl Spencer, 468-480.

Johnson, Dr Samuel, 456-458, 460-461, 463, 465-466.

Jones, Henry Arthur, 179-180.

Jowitt, Lord, 112.

Juan, Infante Don, 139, 148-151.

K.

Kames, Lord, 461, 463.

Kennedy, Captain A. L., 'Lord Hardinge of Penshurst,' 97—'Britain and the Peace: The Search for Security,' 153—'Reorganisation of the Foreign Service,' 397.

Kennedy, Sir John, 397-398.

Kerr, Walter, 'The Russian Army,' 453.

Keynes, Lord, 40-41.

Khare, Dr, 63-64.

Kiely, Benedict, 'Counties of Contention,' 501.

Knox, Sir Geoffrey, 263.

Kridl, Manfred, joint editor of 'The Democratic Heritage of Poland,' 246-247.

L.

Lancaster, Lieut.-Colonel, M.P., 419.

Lang of Lambeth, Archbishop Lord, 336.

Lansdowne, 5th Marquess of, 97-98, 401.

Lasker, Bruno, 'Peoples of South-East Asia,' 430, 433.

Latham, Lord, 3.

Lattimore, Owen and Eleanor, 'The Making of Modern China,' 249.

Laval, Pierre, 11, 381.

Law, Rt Hon. R. K., 254, 412.

Law and Poor Persons, The, 71-84.

Leach, F. Burton, 'Burma,' 430.

Lebrun, Albert, 5.

Le Clerc, General, 382, 390.

Lee, Jennie, 'Our Ally Russia,' 96 note.
 Lee, Sir Sidney, 458.
Leprosy in the Empire, 308-321.
 'Leprosy Review, The,' 308, 315-317, 319-321.
 Lewis, C. S., 'Preface to Paradise Lost,' 424.
 Lewis, John L., 417.
 Lewis, Mrs Wyndham, 46.
 Ley, Robert, 362.
 Lindsay, Sir Ronald, 399.
 Linlithgow, Marquess of, 57-58, 67.
 Lippmann, Walter, 'U.S. War Aims,' 152-155, 157, 164.
Lloyd, Rev. Canon Roger, 'The Christian Contribution to Social Order,' 421.
 Lloyd George, 1st Earl, 48, 103-104, 237.
 Lloyd George, Major Rt Hon. G., 190, 193, 195, 199, 238.
 Loftus, Lord Augustus, 282.
Lord Hardinge of Penshurst, 97-104.
 Lothian, 11th Marquess of, 227-228, 399.
Loveday, Arthur F., 'Spain: Monarchy or Republic?' 138.
Lovett, Sir Verney, 'India in 1944,' 57.
 Lyons, Sir Henry, 'The Royal Society, 1660-1940,' 128.

M.

Mabane, Rt Hon. W., 412.
 MacArthur, General, 231.
 Macaulay, Lord, 293, 457-458.
 MacDonald, Rt Hon. Ramsay, 130.
 Macmahon, Sir Henry, 393.
 Madariaga, Salvador de, 'Spain,' 144, 146.
 Mahajani, Dr G. S., 168.
 Malinowski, Wladyslaw, joint editor of 'The Democratic Heritage of Poland,' 246-247.
 Malmesbury, 3rd Earl of, 282.
 Mander, Sir Frederick, 235.
 Marahrens, Bishop, 20.
Marriott, Sir J. A. R., 'The Bank of England and Bretton Woods,' 28.
 de Mauley, Lord, 51.
 Maura, Miguel, 145.

Mayer, J. P., 'Max Weber and German Politics,' 122-123.
 Melbourne, Archbishop of, 338-339.
 Mendelssohn, Peter de, 'Japan's Political Warfare,' 123.
 Menzies, Sir Frederick, 235.
 Meredith, George, 186.
 Milne, James, 'Over the Hills and Far Away,' 374-375.
 Milner, Viscount, 103.
 Milton, John, 425-426.
Modern Drama Renaissance, The, 176-187.
 Molesworth, Major-General, 59, note 63.
 Montagu, Charles, 30-31.
 Montgomery, Field-Marshal Sir Bernard, 105, 229, 383.
 Morehead, F. T., 'The Forests of Burma,' 431.
 Moreland, W. H., joint author of 'A Short History of India,' 247.
 Morgan, Charles, 450.
 Morris, Adah V., joint editor of 'Nineteenth Century Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, 1890-1899, with Supplementary Indexing, 1900-1922,' 126-127.
 Mountbatten, Admiral Lord Louis, 62.
 Muir, Ernest, 'Leprosy Diagnosis, Treatment and Prevention,' 308—joint author of 'Leprosy,' 308, 320.
Mullins, Claud, 'The Law and Poor Persons,' 71.
 Munster, Earl of, 64-66, 190.
 Murray, Professor Sir Gilbert, 184.
 Mussolini, Benito, 16, 290, 361-362.

N.

Namier, L. B., 'Conflicts,' 272.
 Nansen, Dr, 262.
 Napoleon I, 24, 335.
 Needham, A., 'How to Study an Old Church,' 127-128.
Neglected Prophet A., 444-455.
 Negrin, Dr, 144-146.
 Nehru, Pandit Jawahir Lal, 165-166, 176.
New Deal for Coal, A, 413-421.
 Newman, Cardinal, 338.
 Newton, Sir Basil, 405.

New Trends in Diplomacy, 281-295.

Nicolson, Hon. Harold, 'Life of Lord Carnock,' 102, 266.

Norman, Montagu, Lord, 407.

P.

Palmerston, Viscount, 282, note 398, 401, 412, 472.

Panikar, K. M., 'The Future of South-East Asia,' 430, 442.

Passfield, Lord, 'How to Pay for the War,' 130.

Paterson, William, 31.

Pearn, B. R., 'Burma Background,' 430.

Peel, Sir Robert, 32, 34, 477.

Pepys, Samuel, 205.

Perth, Earl of, 264-265, 406.

Pétain, Marshal, 11-13, 381-382, 395.

Petrie, Sir Flinders, 'Janus in Modern Life,' 444, 446-451, 455—'The Revolutions of Civilisation,' 444-446—'Some Sources of Human History,' 444.

Phillips, Rhys, 48-49.

Pittfour, Lord, 463-464.

Pitt, William, 33, 471-473.

Pleven, René, 384.

Poincaré, Raymond, 13-14.

Pollock, Sir John, *Bl.*, 'France of To-Morrow,' 1—'The Popish Plot,' 125—'In France To-Day,' 377.

Pope-Hennessy, James, joint author of 'The Houses of Parliament,' 497-498.

Pottle, Professor F. A., 456-457, 459, 467.

Pradera, Victor, 'The New State,' 149.

Prieto, Indalecio, 144-146.

Pure Milk, 480-495.

Q.

'Q,' 'Memories and Opinions,' 245.

Quennell, Peter, 'Four Portraits,' 375.

R.

Rajagopalachari, Mr, 65, 67.

Rank, J. Arthur, 330, 333-334.

Rattray, R. F., *Ph.D.*, 'The Modern Drama Renaissance,' 176—'A Neglected Prophet,' 444.

Redfern, James, 183.

Redmayne, Sir Richard, 419.

Reid, Sir Robert, 58-59.

Renault, Louis, 11.

Reorganisation of the Foreign Service, 397-412, 504.

Report of Bishop's Commission on City Churches, 201-215.

Ribbentrop, J. von, 16.

Robles, Gil, 143.

Rogers, Dr Charles, 456.

Rogers, Sir Leonard, joint author of 'Leprosy,' 308-310, 313, 320.

Rolo, C. J., 'Wingate's Raiders,' 431.

Roosevelt, President F. D., 117, 233, 365.

'Round Table, The,' 57.

Roy, M. N., 63, 68.

'Royal Central Asian Journal, The,' 57.

Ruddiman, Thomas, 460-461.

Rule of Law in Prevention of War, The, 215-228.

Rundstedt, Field-Marshal von, 229-230, 241.

Russell, Lord John, 479-480.

Rutherford, Sir Thomas, 60.

S.

Salisbury, 3rd Marquess of, 258-259, note 398, 401, 412, 504.

Salter, Sir Arthur, 412.

Samuel, Maurice, 'The Great Hatred,' 269.

Sargent, Sir Orme, 403.

Sarma, Sir Srinavasa, 168.

Sastri, Srinavasa, 167.

Saw, Reginald, 'The Bank of England, 1694-1944: Its Buildings Past and Present,' 28, 30.

Schreiber, Charles, 45, 56.

Scobie, General, 140.

Sein, Ma Mya, 'Burma,' 430, 432.

Selby, Sir Walford, 410.

Sencourt, Robert, 'King Alfonso,' 148—'New Trends in Diplomacy,' 281.

Seton-Watson, Hugh, 'Eastern Europe Between the Wars, 1918-1941,' 502-503.

Shaftesbury, 7th Earl of, 278.

Shakespeare, William, 178, 423, 425-426.
 Shaw, Bernard, 'Our Theatre in the Nineties,' 176, 180-184, 444.
 Short, Bishop, 344.
 Short, Ernest, 'Theatrical Cavalcade,' 176, 179.
 Sibbald, Sir Robert, 464.
 Simmons, Jack, 'Southey,' 372.
 Sinclair, Sir Archibald, 108.
 'Sir Louis Stuart's Indian News Sheets,' 57.
 Sitwell, Sir Osbert, 'Left Hand Right Hand,' 371-372.
 Sitwell, Sacheverell, 'British Architects and Craftsmen,' 496-497.
 Smillie, Robert, 191.
 Smith, R. A. Lendon, 'Bath,' 121.
 Smuts, Field-Marshal, 226.
Some Problems of Post-War Organisation: A Biological Approach, 152-165.
Some Recent Books, 121-128, 242-251, 369-376, 496-503.
 Sophocles, 177.
Soviet Courts and Constitutional Rights, 85-96.
Spain: Monarchy or Republic? 138-151.
 Spate, O. H. K., 'Burma Setting,' 430.
Spencer, The Earl, 'John Charles, Viscount Althorp, Third Earl Spencer,' 468.
 Spencer, 2nd Earl, 468-470, 472-473, 475, 478-479.
 Spencer, 3rd Earl, 468-480.
 Spencer, Herbert, 95.
 Spencer, Lavinia, Countess, 468-469, 471, 473-474, 479.
Sprawson, Major-General Sir Cuthbert, 'Leprosy in the Empire,' 308.
 Srivastava, Sir Jwala, 70.
 Stalin, Generalissimo, 85, 87, 92-96, 251, 257, 290, 452-453.
 Stanley, Colonel Hon. Oliver, 320.
 Steinberg, Dr S. H., 'A Short History of Germany,' 121-122.
 Stettinius, Edward, 260.
 Stevenson, H. N. C., 'The Hill Peoples of Burma,' 431.
 Stockmar, Baron, 282.
 Stowe, Leland, 'They Shall Not Sleep,' 430, 433.
 Strabolgi, Lord, 64-65.

Swaffer, Hannen, 234.
 Swing, Raymond Gram, 241.
 Swinton, Viscount, 109.
 'Swords and Ploughshares,' 165.

T.

Tait, Archbishop, 52.
 Talleyrand, Prince de, 282, note 398.
 Tansley, Professor A. G., 'Our Heritage of Wild Nature,' 372-373.
 Tardieu, André, 13.
 Tavernier, René, editor of 'Confluences,' 375-376.
 Temple, Archbishop Frederick, 203.
 Temple, Archbishop William, 112, 234.
 Templewood, Viscount, 412.
 Thorneycroft, Captain, M.P., 419.
Thoughts on the Education Act, 295-308.
 Tinker, J., M.P., 196.
 Tinker, Professor, 456.
 Tirpitz, Admiral von, 217.
 Tooke, Thomas, 33.
 Train, Joseph, 466.
 Trans-Jordan, Amir Abdullah of, 394.
 Travancore, Diwan of, 67.
 Trevelyan, Professor G. M., 'English Social History,' 421-423, 425.
 Truman, President, 267.

U.

'United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference, Final Act,' 28, 36-38.

V.

Vandenberg, Senator Arthur, 233.
 Vansittart, Lord, 18-19, 288.
 Vedrenne, J. E., 183.
 Ventosa, Juan, 142.
 Victoria, Queen, 51, 53-54, 98, 149, 282.
 Victoria Eugénie, Queen, 149.

W.

Waldman, Milton, 'Elizabeth and Leicester,' 243-244.

- Walford, E. O., LL.D.*, 'Soviet Courts and Constitutional Rights,' 85.
Wallace, Henry A., 233.
Warriner, P. L., joint author of 'Food and Farming in Post-War Europe,' 152-153, 157-158.
Watson, Sir Alfred, 57.
Wavell, Field-Marshal Viscount, 57, 60-63, 65-67, 69-70.
Webb, S. and B., 'Soviet Communism,' 87-88.
Weiss, Francis, 'Walzing Volcano,' 245-246.
Welles, Sumner, 'An Intelligent American's Guide to the Peace,' 230.
Wellesley, Sir Victor, 'Diplomacy in Fetters,' 281-283, 286, 288-289, 291-293, 399, 403, 407, 411.
West, Rev. Arthur G. B., 'Report of Bishop's Commission on City Churches,' 201—'The Church and Australia,' 335.
Westcott, Bishop, 336, 345.
Westlake, Professor, 'International Law,' 216-217.
Weymouth, Anthony, 'Through a Leper Squint,' 308.
Why not Nationalise the Mines? 187-201.
Wild, Hans, joint author of 'The Houses of Parliament,' 497-498.
William II, Kaiser, 217, 219.
Wilson, President Woodrow, 153-154.
Wingate, Major-General O. C., 432.
Winnington-Ingram, Bishop, 203.
Winterton, Earl, 325.
Withers, Hartley, 29-30.
Wittlein, Josef, joint editor of 'The Democratic Heritage of Poland,' 246-247.
Wood, Major-General, 58.
Woodhead, Sir John, 69.
Woodward, Professor, 294.
Wooldridge, Dr Walter R., 'Pure Milk,' 480.
Worsley, J. W. B., D.C.L., 'The Rule of Law in Prevention of War,' 215, 264.
Wren, Sir Christopher, 202, 206, 211.
- Y.
- Yates, P. L.*, joint author of 'Food and Farming in Post-War Europe,' 152-153, 157-158.
Yeats, W. B., 187.
Yeats Brown, Major, 'Martial India,' 165, 173.
York, Archbishop of, 3.
York, Frederick, Duke of, 472.
Young, Edward, 'Night Thoughts,' 467.
- Z.
- Zamora, Alcalá*, 145-146.
Zhukov, Marshal, 241.

END OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-THIRD VOLUME

RED CROSS AND BERLIN

EMBASSY 1915-1926

*Extracts from the diaries of
Viscountess D'Abernon*

With Illustrations. About 10s. 6d. net

In the 1914-18 war in France, and especially in Italy, Lady D'Abernon had remarkable experiences as an anæsthetist with Red X hospitals, often very near the front line. At Armistice time she was in Paris and saw many of the political and military leaders there.

In 1920 Lord D'Abernon was appointed Ambassador in Berlin. His highly successful term of office is now a matter of history.

Lady D'Abernon in her diaries shows something of the important part which she played in restoring more normal social relations with Germans, official and otherwise, and of her intercourse with the Diplomatic Corps. Ebert, Stresemann, Rathenau, Hindenburg and many other well-known Germans come into her pages.

This contemporary record is both historically valuable and delectably readable.

Advance Announcement

**ELIZABETH LADY HOLLAND
TO HER SON**

Letters to Henry Edward 4th Lord Holland, 1821-1845

Edited by the Earl of Ilchester

Author of "The Home of the Hollands, 1605-1820," "Chronicles of Holland House, 1820-1900," "The Life and Letters of Lady Sarah Lennox, 1745-1820."

With a Frontispiece. About 18s. net

Holland House, now alas roofless and ruined as the result of German bombs, has proved to be in the past a mine of literary and historic treasure and the source of many excellent books. Luckily the mine is not yet worked out, as this new volume proves.

Princes, politicians, authors, soldiers, scientists, divines, wits and dandies, all were irresistibly drawn to Holland House, ready to risk the lash of Lady Holland's tongue for the sake of her kindly husband and the good company which they provided. Her letters, like her tongue, were barbed, often critical, often surprisingly kind, of no great literary grace but of forcible expression and full of interest.

This series of intimate letters to her son Henry Edward, afterwards 4th and last Lord Holland, ranges over the field of political, social and literary life at one of its most notable periods.

World News by Magazine

This has been our business for over seventy years and we feel competent to give you the service which you desire.

We are the largest and most reliable agency for prompt delivery of Foreign and Domestic Periodicals in this Country.

The latest English, Irish and German Publications we carry in stock.

We call especial attention to the beautiful Christmas Editions, forming a group of magazines that have a peculiar interest to people of culture.

Our subscription prices include postage to all parts of the United States, Cuba, Mexico, Porto Rico and P. I.

Our BACK NUMBER DEPT. can furnish quick service in supplying you with old issues.

For quick and efficient service send your orders for Foreign Publications to

THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY

Division of THE AMERICAN NEWS COMPANY, INC.

131 Varick Street, New York City

Send for Price List

5824 +

